Acton. d. 1. 51.

AN Historical Treatise OF THE FOUNDATION AND PREROGATIVES OF THE Church of Rome, And of Her BISHOPS.

Written Originally in French

By Monsieur MAIMBOURG,

And Translated into English

By *A. LOVEL*, A. M.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COLLECTION 1907

LONDON,
Printed for *Jos. Hindmarsh*, Bookseller to His *Royal Highness*, at the *Black Bull* in *Cornhill*. MDCLXXXV.

see 225:03

The TRANSLATOR to the READER.

I Should be thought perhaps, no leſs unmannerly than fanciful, if I offered any other reaſon of the Authors publiſhing this Book, than what he himſelf is pleaſed to give in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to his Great Maſter, the Moſt Chriſtian King; which is, that he might thereby according to his duty, ſecond the grand deſign of the King and his Gallican Church, in removing thoſe obſtacles that hinder the reconciliation of Diſſenting Believers, and in confuting the miſtakes of Authors, who have occaſioned either a ſcandalous ſeparation from the Unity of the Church, or a perſiſtance in that Separation. Yet ſeeing the Book before it came out, and ſince it hath been Publiſhed, hath made no ſmall noiſe at Rome, the French Court, and elſewhere;

The Reader possibly, may think that so Publick and Religious a design hath been either very ill Managed, or far worse Interpreted. I have nothing to say as to that, it being a matter above my reach; but I know the Ingenious will be apt to make remarks, such as are now a days very frequent; that no great matter ought, or, indeed can be brought about, if Religion came not in for a share, and if that turn not the World, it will be hard for any thing else to convert it. There is Religion, so called, that makes Turks fight against Christians, and Christians not fight against Turks; that makes some States invade the Rights of the Church, and some Churches usurp upon the State; that makes the Godly Plot and fight for Peace sake, and the harmless Doves as innocent as Serpents. And since these and many other such Principles are now a days in great vogue over most part of the World; one may venture to say, of the

Religion which many, nay I would it were not, moſt Men practiſe at preſent, what the Great Author *of our true Religion ſays of the Wind*; It bloweth where it liſteth, and Men hear the ſound of it; but neither know whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth. *And I ſhould not be irreverent beyond example, if I called it downright* Hocus Pocus.

This may ſeem to the Reader an extravagance, and a ſtart out of the road; but I had nothing elſe to ſay for my ſelf in attempting to Tranſlate a Book that, like a Quarter-Staff ſtrikes on both Hands, pelts Proteſtants and knocks down the Pope; ſave only that nothing of Modern Religion moved me to it (for, indeed, I find not that I have any inward call to labour in anothers Vineyard) but perceiving that this is an Age wherein People either open their own Eyes, or deſire they ſhould be opened, I was very willing, ſince I am no loſer, nor I hope the Government of-

fended by it, to reach to others the Eye-salve *that hath been handed to me. And truly, if by impartial Readers, the issue of a Mans* Religion *should be tried by the verdict of the Authors Book, perhaps it would be no easie matter to decide the Point; since they'll find in it, too much either for a* True Protestant, *or a truly* Jesuited Papist.

How far this may justifie my undertaking I cannot tell; but since the Book-seller can satisfie the Reader, *with how great dispatch it hath been Translated, I hope, he will be so kind as to pardon the hasty mistakes of the Translator.*

A. Lovell.

The

The Author's Epiſtle Dedicatory

TO THE

FRENCH KING.

SIR,

ONE of the greateſt impediments that hinders the reunion of Proteſtants with the *Roman* Church, from which by a fatal Schiſm they are ſeparated, is that falſe Opinion wherewith they are prejudiced, that we raiſe the Popes even above the Univerſal Church, in attributing to them what only belongs to her, and in giving them an abſolute and unlimited Power not only in Spirituals, but alſo over the Temporal and Crowns of Princes.

The *Gallican* Church, willing to help on that great zeal which *Your Majeſty* makes ſo conſpicuouſly ſuc-

cessful for the Conversion of your Subjects who continue still in Error, hath thought that she could not do any thing to better purpose, than to remove that obstacle, by undeceiving them, and professing, as she hath done by a solemn Declaration upon a Point of that importance; her Doctrine which is in all things conform to that of the Ancient Church.

It is the business of this Treatise, which is purely Historical, to make this out by matters of fact, against which no subtlety, argumentation, nor Artifice of Novelty can hold good. Nay, Sir, I dare even present it to *Your Majesty* as a Work that, perhaps, may be so happy as to contribute somewhat in making the Justice of your Edict known to the World, whereby, in quality of Protector of the Canons, you make the Ancient belief current

in

in the moſt Chriſtian Kingdom.

This it is, Sir, that makes it truly to be ſaid, that *Your Majeſty* hath done more for the Church of *Rome* than the Kings your Predeceſſors, who have enriched her with the great Revenues ſhe poſſeſſes, and who have raiſed her to the pinacle of Temporal Grandeur and Dignities. For, indeed, all that Wealth and theſe Worldly Grandeurs belong not to her true Kingdom, which being that of *Jeſus Chriſt*, ought not to be of this World. But in commanding by your Laws, that this Doctrin of Antiquity be maintained in *France*, to which the *Gallican* Church, which hath always vigouroufly defended the intereſts and juſt Prerogatives of the Church of *Rome*, hath in all Ages inviolably adhered: You moſt ſolidly eſtabliſh the Primacy of the Pope againſt the Novel

Novel attempts of Hereticks who diſpute it, and do all that they can to ſnatch it from him. At the ſame time you take from them the pretext of their Revolt, by letting them ſee, that we believe not that which ſcandaliſes them, and which ſome late Divines attribute to him, of their own Head, againſt the manifeſt Judgment of Antiquity.

That, *Sir*, is what may be called an effectual endeavour for reſtoring the true Kingdom of the Church of *Rome* to its Juſt Rights, from which Hereticks, who have ſeparated from it through erroneous Notions that have been given them of our Doctrin, have in little more than an Age rent away a great part of *Europe*. *Your Majeſty* who hath wrought and ſtill work ſo many Miracles, to render your Kingdom more Powerful and more

flouriſh-

flouriſhing than ever, and to grant us once more a general Peace, by making our Enemies accept it, upon the conditions you thought fit to preſcribe to them, is apparently appointed of God to work the greateſt of all, in pacifying the troubles of Religion, and in rendering to the Kingdom of the Church in *France*, its ancient extent, by the reduction of the remnant of our Proteſtants.

For my own part, who have but very little longer to live, and, who, according to my Profeſſion, can contribute nothing to your Conqueſts, but by my ardent Prayers: I ſhall reckon my ſelf moſt happy, and ſhall die content, if I can but joyn a little by my Pen, to thoſe which you daily Atchieve for enlarging the Empire of the Church, by the Converſion of Hereticks, which by moſt

ſoft

soft and efficacious ways you procure; And if by my Writings and particularly by this, I can make it known to all the World, as I hope I may, that I am as true a Catholick as a good *French* Man, and that I will die, as I have lived,

SIR,

Your Majesties

Most Humble, most Obedient, and Faithful Subject and Servant,

LOUIS MAIMBOURG.

A TABLE OF The Chapters and of their Contents.

CHAP. I.

The design, and draught of this Treatise; and the Principle upon which it moves.

THE true Church is the Kingdome of Jesus Christ. The definition thereof. Its unity in the multitude of particular Churches which make but one Episcopacy, and one Chair, by the communion they have with a chief Church, which is the center of their Unity. Antiquity is to be followed against Novelty in Doctrin that is contrary to it. Upon this Prin-

Principle it is proved in this Treatise against the new Opinions, what Antiquity hath believed of the first Foundation, and Prerogatives of that chief Church which is the Church of Rome. Page 1.

CHAP. II.

Of the Foundation and Establishment of the Church of *Rome*. That St. *Peter* hath been at *Rome*.

A Refutation of the Erroneous reasons that some Protestants alledge for overthrowing that Truth. St. Luke hath omitted a great many other things which notwithstanding are true. The true Chronology which agrees with the progress and coming of St. Peter *to* Antioch *and* Rome, *against the wrong Chronology contrived to subvert it. There were Christians at* Rome *when St. Paul arrived there. All Antiquity hath believed that St. Peter was at* Rome. *The Extravagance of those who have said that the Fathers were mistaken in taking the Country of* Rome *in* Romania *for the City of* Rome. Page 13

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

That the Church of *Rome* hath been founded by St. *Peter*; that he was the first Bishop of it; and that the Popes are his Successors in that Bishoprick.

THAT truth acknowledged by all Antiquity. In what sense Bishops sit in St. Peter's Chair, and are his Successors; and how Popes are in another manner. Page 31

CHAP. IV.

Of the Primacy of St. *Peter*, and that he hath been established by Jesus Christ Head of the Universal Church.

THE true interpretation of these words Thou art *Peter* and upon that Rock will I build my Church. *How the Church is built upon Jesus Christ, upon the confession of his Divinity, and on the person of St. Peter. His Primacy of Jurisdiction over all Believers, proceeds from the confession of Faith which he made for all the rest. All Antiquity hath acknowledged that Primacy of St. Pe-*

St. Peter, *and of all his Successors in the Bishoprick of* Rome. Page 37

CHAP. V.

Of the Rights and advantages that the Primacy gives to the Bishop of *Rome* over other Bishops.

WHAT *the Council of* Florence *decided as to that. The superintendence of the Pope over all that concerns the Government and good of the Church in General. The right he hath of calling Councils for the Spiritual, and presiding in them. That appeals may be made to his Tribunal, and that he ought to judge of greater causes. An illustrious instance of that Supreme Authority of the Pope in the History of Pope* Agapetus, *of the Patriarch* Anthimius *and the Emperor* Justinian. *The prodigious Ignorance of* Calvin *in Ecclesiastical History. The System of his Heresie quite contrary to the Doctrine of Antiquity. What are the Prerogatives of Popes, that are disputed amongst Catholicks.* Page 31

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

The ſtate of the Queſtion concerning the Infallibility of the Pope.

WHether or not when he defines without a Council, and without the conſent of the Church he may err. p. 72

CHAP. VII.

What Antiquity hath concluded from that that St. *Peter* was reproved by St. *Paul.*

WHether St. Peter *was blame-worthy. His action is called an error by St.* Auſtin. *The opinion of St.* Jerome *refuted by that holy Doctor. He compares the Error of St.* Cyprian *with that of St.* Peter. *The Hiſtory of the Error of* Vigilius *in regard of the three Chapters, and his change compared by* Pelagius II. *with the Error and change of St.* Peter. *The Schiſm of the Occidentals founded upon the conſtitution of Vigilius. According to Pope* Pelagius, *for quenching that Schiſm; the*

Holy See is to be followed in its change, as believers were obliged to imitate St. Peter *in that which he made from evil to good. St.* Paul *believed not St.* Peter *to be infallible. It was before the Council of* Jeruſalem *that St.* Peter *was reproved by St.* Paul. *The true interpretation of that paſſage,* I have prayed for thee *Peter* that thy faith fail not. P. 77

CHAP. VIII.

What follows naturally from the great conteſt of Pope *Victor* with the Biſhops of *Aſia.*

Different cuſtoms in the Church concerning the celebration of Eaſter, *and of the Faſt before that Feaſt. The good intelligence betwixt Pope St.* Anicetus *and St.* Polycarp *Biſhop of* Smyrna, *notwithſtanding the diverſity of their cuſtoms. The Decree of Pope* Victor *rejected by* Polycrates *Biſhop of* Epheſus, *and by the other Aſiaticks. St.* Irenæus *in name of the* Gallican *Church, oppoſes Pope* Victor. *None of theſe Biſhops of the Eaſt and Weſt, believed the Pope to be infallible.* p. 103

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

What ought to be inferred from the famous debate that was betwixt the Pope St. *Stephen* and St. *Cyprian* concerning the Baptiſm of Hereticks.

WHAT was the Judgment of St. Cyprian *in that queſtion, and what was that of St.* Stephen. *Councils held thereupon on both ſides. The Decrees of the one and other quite contrary. St.* Stephen *cuts off from his Communion the Biſhops that would not ſubmit to his Decree. Neither theſe Biſhops, nor St.* Cyprian *did for all that change their opinion and practice. It was alſo permitted long after the death of St.* Cyprian *to maintain the ſame opinion, and to follow the ſame conduct. The Holy Fathers who held a Doctrin contrary to the Decree of the Pope St.* Stephen. *What the great Council of* Arles, Nice *and* Conſtantinople *have decided as to that queſtion. All then, except the Donatiſts ſubmitted to the Decrees of theſe Councils, becauſe they were believed to be Infallible, which was not thought of Popes.* p. 111

CHAP. X.

The fall of Liberius.

HIS *Letters published in all places, wherein he condemns St.* Athanasius, *suppresses the term* [*Consubstantial*] *receives the* Arians *to his Communion, and subscribes the Formulary of* Sirmium. *He is for that deposed by the Church of* Rome. p. 135

CHAP. XI.

The instance of Pope *Vigilius.*

THE *constitution of that Pope for the three Chapters. The fifth Council which is Infallible condemns them.* p. 140

CHAP. XII.

The condemnation of *Honorius* in the sixth Council.

THE *History of* Monotheliſm. *Pope* Honorius *willing to agree both parties, writes Letters to* Patriarch Sergius *which*

which the Monothelites *made uſe of for Authoriſing their Hereſie. The Popes* John IV. Theodore *and St.* Martin *follow a contrary conduct to his. The Emperor* Conſtantine Pogonatus *with conſent of Pope* Agatho *calls the ſixth Council. The Hiſtory of that Council. The Letters of* Sergius *and* Honorius *are examined there. They are condemned of Hereſie, and that Pope is Anathematiſed. He is alſo condemned in the Emperors Edict, in the Letter of* Leo II. *to the Emperor. In the Ancient diurnal Book of* Rome, *in the Ancient Breviaries, and in the* VII. *and* VIII. *Councils. Convincing Arguments that the Acts of the ſixth Council have not been falſified, and that it cannot be ſaid, that the Fathers of that Council underſtood not well the meaning of* Honorius. *All Antiquity which hath received that Council as we have it, hath believed that the Pope is not infallible.* p. 143

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Popes *Clement* III. *Innocent* III. *Boniface* VIII. and *Sixtus.* V.

THE Error of Clement *in his Decretal* Laudabilem, *recalled by* Innocent III. *The Error of* Innocent *concerning the secret of Confession. He condemns that Error in the Council of* Lateran. *That of* Boniface *in his Bull* unam Sanctam, *recalled at the Council of* Vienna. *That of* Sixtus V. *in the Edition of his Bible. A ridiculous Answer of some Moderns.* p. 165

CHAP. XIV.

The instance of *John* XXII.

WHAT he did for Establishing his Error concerning the beatifick vision. The sacred Faculty of Paris *declares the Doctrin of that Pope heretical. It had been condemned by* Clement IV, *and was since in the Council of* Florence. *King* Philip *of* Valois *obliges that Pope to recant.* p. 173

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

The tradition of the Church of *Rome* as to that.

THE Popes themſelves have acknowledged that for ending difference in Religion by a Sovereign and infallible ſentence, there was a neceſſity of a Council. The Hereſies which Popes have condemned without a General Council, have been ſo condemned by the conſent of the Church. Popes who have confeſſed that they had not the gift of Infallibility. p.179

CHAP. XVI.

The ſtate of the queſtion concerning the Superiority of the Council over the Pope, or of the Pope, over a Council.

WHether after a Council is lawfully Aſſembled, the Pope being preſent in it or not, that Council has, or has not Supreme Authority over the Head as well as over the other Members of the Church, or

whether or not all its Authority depends on the Pope. p.187

CHAP. XVII.

That it is the Holy Ghoſt, which in the definitions of Faith pronounces by the mouth of the Council.

WHAT is to be concluded from that Principle. What it is, according to the Doctrin of Antiquity, to approve and confirm a Council. p.190

CHAP. XVIII.

That the Ancient Councils have examined the Judgments of Popes, to give a laſt and definitive ſentence upon them.

THE Hiſtory of the Patriarch Flavian, *and the Pope St.* Leo *who ſubmits his Judgment to that of a General Council. An inſtance of the fifth Council, that reſcinds a ſentence ſolemnly pronounced by the Pope; and of the ſixth, which examines the ſentences of* Martin I. *and* Honorius I. *approves the one and rejects the*

the other. The History of Constantine, *of the Donatists, and of the first Council of* Arles, *which examines the sentence given by Pope* Melchiades *in his first Council of* Rome. p.199

CHAP. XIX.

That the Ancient Popes have always acknowledged and protested that they were subject to Councils.

THE *History of Pope* Sicicius *and of the Council of* Capona. *Of St.* Leo *in the case of St.* Chrysostom *against the Patriarch* Theophilus. *Of* Innocent III. *in the case of the Marriage of* Philip *the* August. *Instances of Pope St.* Agapetus, *and* Silvester II. p.213

CHAP. XX.

That the Ancient Popes have believed that they were subject to the Canons.

PRoofs *of this from the conduct and protestations of the Popes* Celestin I. *St* Leo, *St.* Martin, *St.* Gregory *the Great,* John

John VIII. Eugenius III. *and* Silveſter II. *What the Council of* Florence *hath defined as to that. The true ſenſe of theſe words againſt a falſe interpretation that hath been made of them. Popes are obliged to govern the Church according to the Canons. In what caſe they can diſpenſe with them. That they may abuſe their Power. Of an Appeal to a Council, and of an Appeal as abuſive to a Parliament.* p.225

CHAP. XXI.

What General Councils have decided as to that Point.

THE Hiſtory of the Council of Piſa, *where that queſtion was firſt canvaſſed. The debates that aroſe upon that Subject in the Council of* Conſtance, *which is a continuation of that of* Piſa. *The Decrees of that Council of* Conſtance, *and of that of* Baſil *upon the ſame Point. The approbation of theſe Decrees by the Popes* Martin V. *and* Eugenius IV. p.241

CHAP. XXII.

Of the Writing of the *Sieur Emmanuel Schelſtrate* againſt the two Decrees of the Council of *Conſtance*.

THE Declaration which the Clergy of France *met in the Year* 1682. *made of their Opinion touching theſe two Decrees, which they hold to be of infallible Authority, approved by Popes, and for thoſe times when there is no Schiſm, as well as during a Schiſm. The* Sieur Emmanuel Schelſtrate *undertakes to refute theſe three Articles in the three Chapters of his Diſſertation.* p. 256

CHAP. XXIII.

A Refutation of the firſt Chapter of the Diſſertation of *M. Schelſtrate.*

THE Decree of the fourth Seſſion hath not been falſified by the Fathers of Baſil. *The Manuſcripts of* M. Schelſtrate *are defective, and ours are true. A demonſtration of this Truth by two Sermons of* John Gerſon *who rehearſes that Decree before*

before the whole Council of Constance *word for word as we have it. The Manuscripts by which these two Sermons have been reviewed, and the other places were* Gerson *relates the same Decree. An other demonstration of that truth by Pope* Eugenius IV. *and even by the Manuscripts of* M. Schelstrate. *That question was sufficiently examined. The Council consisted of the greatest and soundest part of the three obediences, and the absence of others hinders not the Council from being lawful.* p. 261

CHAP. XXIV.

A Refutation of one of the two other Chapters of *M. Schelstrate.*

PRoofs of the approbation of these two Decrees of Constance. *The true interpretation of that word* Conciliariter. *The abuse that may be made of the Appeal to a Council is condemned, but not the Appeal it self. All the Authority of Councils proceeds not from the Pope, but chiefly from the Catholick Church.* p. 297

CHAP.

CHAP. XXV.

A Refutation of the other Chapter of *M. Schelſtrate.*

These two Decrees of the Council of Constance *are for all times, whilſt there was a Schiſm, and when there is none. An Ecumenical Council is a* whole, *whereof the Pope is but a part. The Pope is the Head, but not the Maſter of the Church. The difference betwixt the Power of Popes and of Kings. An authentick act of the Superiority of a Council over the Pope. What it ſignifies in* M. Schelſtrates *Manuſcript.* That the Pope Elected cannot be bound. *The Judgment of the Univerſity of* Paris *and of the* Gallican *Church concerning the ſuperiority of a Council over the Pope.* p. 317

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVI.

The ſtate of the Queſtion touching the Power that ſome Doctors have attributed to Popes over the Temporal.

THE *diſtinction of the direct and indirect Power.* P. 341

CHAP. XXVII.

What Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles have taught us as to that.

A *Falſe diſtinction of* Buchanans *refuted. It was upon an obligation of Conſcience, and not through weakneſs, that Chriſtians obeyed infidel Emperors and Perſecutors. The Allegiance that Subjects owe to their Sovereigns is of Divine Right, with which Popes cannot diſpence. All the paſſages cited for the contrary opinion are underſtood contrary to the interpretation of the Fathers of the Church; which is forbidden by the Council of* Trent. P. 345

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVIII.

What hath been the Judgment of the Ancient Fathers of the Church as to that Point.

THE diſtribution that God hath made of the Spiritual for the Church and her Paſtors, and of the Temporal for Kings. An Exhortation of the paſſage Here are two Swords. *Dominion forbidden to the Popes, and how.* p. 359

CHAP. XXIX.

The Judgment of Ancient Popes touching the Power over Temporals that ſome Doctors of late times attribute to the Pope.

THE Teſtimony of Gelaſius. *Of* Gregory II. *That Pope offered not to depoſe* Leo Iſauricus, *nor to make* Rome *revolt againſt him. Teſtimonies of* Pelagius I. Stephen II. *St.* Gregory *the Great, and of* Martin I. *ſuppoſititious Bulls of St.* Gregory. *Pope* Gregory VII. *is the firſt that offered*

offered to depose Emperors. Pope Zachary *deposed not* Childerick; *and* Leo III. *transferred not the Empire to* Charlemagne. *p.* 370

CHAP. XXX.

What hath always been the Opinion of the *Gallican* Church and of all *France* as to that. The Conclusion of this Point and of the whole Treatise.

HOW *the Bishops of* France *opposed the attempts of* Gregory IV. *against* Louis *the* Debonnaire. *They have always done the like upon all occasions. What the Chamber of the Clergy declared concerning the absolute independence of our Kings, in the Estates Assembled in* 1914. *Their Declaration in the year* 1682. *in relation to the same Subject. The sentences of Parliament and the Edicts of Kings upon the same occasion. Conclusion of this Treatise. p.* 387

Pre-

AN *Historical Treatise* Concerning the FOUNDATION AND PREROGATIVES OF THE CHURCH of *ROME*, And of her BISHOPS.

CHAP. I.

The Design and Draught of this Work, and the Principle on which it moves.

TO maintain a State in peace and tranquillity, which makes Subjects happy, according to the scope that true *Policie* proposes

to it ſelf; The firſt thing that is to be done, is to beat off the enemy that hath taken up Arms for the ruine of it, and then to take care, that the quarrels and troubleſome conteſts, which ſometimes ariſe amongſt the chief members of the State, proceed not ſo far, as to occaſion a Civil War.

All Chriſtians agree, that the true *Church of Jeſus Chriſt*, is that *Spirituall Kingdom*, which he came to eſtabliſh in this world; and which nevertheleſs, as he himſelf hath ſaid, *is not of this world*; becauſe the whole end of it is to procure us eternal happineſs, a thing, no ways to be attained to upon Earth. *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks* have often riſen againſt the *Lord* and his *Chriſt*, that they might overturn that beautifull kingdom, and eſtabliſh their particular Churches upon its ruines; every one pretending, that *his* is the Church of the Lord; though, indeed, they be no more, all of them, but the Synagogue of *Satan*; and the Kingdom of him, who, in the Goſpel,

Goſpel, is called the *Prince of this world*. Beſides, it falls out many times, that amongſt Catholicks, who alone are members of the true Church, diſputes and controverſies ariſe, which may trouble the tranquillity and peace that *Jeſus Chriſt* hath left unto them, for ſecuring their happineſs in his Kingdom. It is neceſſary then, for the ſervice of the Church, and for maintaining it always in the flouriſhing ſtate wherein *Jeſus Chriſt* hath eſtabliſhed it, to fight and beat off the enemies that attack it, and to compoſe and calme the quarrels that ariſe amongſt the children of the *Church*, about points that are diſputed with heat, on all hands, and which might, in the end, diſturb the repoſe and peace of the Kingdom of the Son of God.

As I have wholly devoted my ſelf to the ſervice of the *Church*, ſo have I endeavoured, as much as lay in my power, to acquit my ſelf of the former of thoſe two duties, in my *Treatiſe of Controverſie*; and eſpecially in that of *The true Church*.

I think I have been pretty ſucceſsfull in that engagement, and repelled all the efforts of our Proteſtants, in making it appear, by evident and unanſwerable Arguments, That there is no true Church but ours; which is enough, without more diſpute, to put an end to all our Controverſies, ſince they acknowledge, with us, that the true Doctrine is always that of the true Church of *Jeſus Chriſt*. I diſcharge my ſelf alſo, as well as I can, of that obligation, in one part of that *Treatiſe*, where I maintain againſt Hereticks, the declared enemies of the *Holy See*, the primacy, rights, power and authority of the viſible *head* of the *Church*. At preſent then, that I may fulfill my duty in its full extent, I muſt labour to prevent the ſpringing up of any dangerous diviſion amongſt Catholicks, by reaſon of ſome private opinions that divide them, as to that important ſubject of the *Church*, into which they are all equally incorporated.

Now that I may ſolidly carry on ſo laudable and neceſſary an undertaking,

taking, It is at firſt to be preſuppoſed, that according to Catholick doctrine, the Univerſal Church, which ought allways to be viſible, and to continue without Interruption, untill the conſummation of all things, is the Society of Chriſtians diſperſed all over the World, united together by the profeſſion of the *True Faith*, the participation of the *True Sacraments*, by the bond of the ſame *Law*, and under one and the ſame *Head*; Becauſe the Church, whoſe firſt and principal property is to be perfectly one, is the myſtical body of *Jeſus Chriſt*; and that the members of a living body may receive the influences of life, they muſt be united to the *Head*. Hence it is, that, according to Saint *Auſtin*, though one may have all the reſt, yet if he be ſeparated from the *Head*, and, by conſequent from the body which is united to him, he is out of the *Church Catholick* by Schiſm; as Hereticks are cut off from it, becauſe of the want of *True Faith*.

Jub. 10. v. 16.
Epheſ. 1. v. 22.
Auguſt. Ep. 50.

Epiſt. 48. p. 151. l. de un. Eccl. c. 4.

And as all the members of the body have not the ſame functions; but the parts that conſtitute it being ſubordinate one to another in a lovely order, there are ſome which are for giving motion to the reſt, by the ſpirits that they ſend over all; and ſome for diſtributing the nouriſhment which the reſt receive for growth, and for perſeverance in the perfection of their ſtate: So amongſt the multitudes of believers that make up the Church, and who cannot all be immediately governed, inſtructed and edified by one ſingle man: for edification of the body of *Jeſus Chriſt*, there muſt be, as the great *Apoſtle* ſpeaks, a great diverſity of Miniſters, and many Paſtours ſubordinate one to another in an holy *Hierarchy*, to the end the people may have the Sacraments adminiſtred unto them, be inſtructed and governed.

Act. 20. v. 28.

And that's the reaſon that there are in the world ſo vaſt a number of particular Churches, which have their ſeveral Biſhops, and which are all

all ſubordinate to a *Principal Church*, of which the Biſhop is the head of all the reſt. And theſe being aſſembled in name of their Churches, in an Oecumenical Council, repreſent the Univerſal Church, which we believe to be infallible, for abſolutely deciding the points of Faith, when her Biſhops, who are the Paſtours and Teachers of Chriſtians, being one and the ſame as well as ſhe, ſay, in her name, to all her members in perfect unity, *Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto, & vobis.*

For as the Univerſal Church is a *whole* conſiſting of all believers, and of all particular Churches, which are one, by the Communion which they have with one *Principal Church*, that is the ſource, principle, root and centre of their Unity, as Saint *Cyprian* ſpeaks: So, according to the doctrine of the ſame holy Father, there is but one Epiſcopacy in the Church, whereof each Biſhop fully poſſeſſes a part; and by conſequent there is but one *Chair*, wherein all Biſhops ſit, by virtue of the Union

Epiſcopatus unus eſt, multorum Epiſcoporum concordi numeroſitate diffuſus. Cypr. *l. de unit. Eccl. & Epiſt.* 55.

Epiſcopatus unus eſt, cujus à ſingulis in ſolidum pars tenetur. Cypr. *Ep.* 52.

Eccleſia una & Cathedra una Domini voce fundata. Cyp. *Ep.* 40.

Ad Trinitatis inſtar, cujus una eſt atque individua poteſtas, unum eſſe per diverſos antiſtites ſacerdotium. Sym. *Ep. ad* Æon. Arelat.

which they have with him, whom they ought to acknowledge for their *Head*. This Pope *Symmachus* explains, in a very ſublime manner, by an excellent compariſon taken from the Trinity. In the ſame manner, ſaith he, as there is but one Omnipotence by the Unity of Eſſence and Nature, which ſo unites the three Perſons, that they are but one God: So amongſt the many Orthodox Churches throughout all Chriſtendom, there is but one onely Prieſthood, that is to ſay, but one Epiſcopacy through the unity, not onely of *Faith* and *Belief*, but alſo of communion of all the Biſhops with a Head, whence reſults that unity which is inſeparable from the Church of *Jeſus Chriſt*.

Aug. on *Pſ.* 101.

This being preſuppoſed, in which all Catholicks do agree, it is certain that *Jeſus Chriſt* himſelf hath eſtabliſhed his Church, which he purchaſed by his own bloud, and unto which he hath given the *Faith*, the *Sacraments*, the *Law* of *Grace* in his Goſpel, and a viſible *Head* to repreſent

Act. 20. v. 28.

ſent him as his *Vicar* upon Earth. And as from a very ſmall beginning it hath enlarged it ſelf (according to the Prophecies) over the whole earth: So alſo the *Apoſtles* and their Succeſſours, after the departure of *Jeſus Chriſt*, have founded particular Churches, eſtabliſhing them themſelves, or ordaining Biſhops for governing the believers diſtributed into ſeveral Dioceſes in all the quarters of the World.

Now ſeeing that particular Church, which within a few years after the Aſcenſion of *Jeſus Chriſt*, was ſetled in the Capital City of the Empire, is without doubt, the moſt illuſtrious of all others; that on the one hand, Hereticks not being able to endure its ſplendour and greatneſs, have always furiouſly riſen up and conſpired to deſtroy it; and that on the other, all Catholicks, who are ſenſible of the real advantages that diſtinguiſh it from all others, are nevertheleſs divided about certain prerogatives which ſome attribute to it, and others diſpute: I ſhall ſhew, without

without ſpeaking of other Churches, what hath been the firſt eſtabliſhment of that of *Rome*, what is the excelling dignity thereof, and what are the prerogatives, rights and privileges of its Biſhops.

And becauſe a ſubject of this nature is not to be handled by Philoſophical reaſonings, but by matters of fact drawn from Scripture, interpreted according to the Fathers, Councils, and ancient Traditions, which are the two principles of true Theology: therefore you are not to expect any ſpeculation or Philoſophy in this Treatiſe, which is purely Hiſtorical. I do in the very entry declare, that there is nothing of mine in this work. For I doe no more, but as a ſincere and exact Hiſtorian, barely alledge, by uncontroverted matters of fact, drawn from the one or other of thoſe two ſources, what venerable Antiquity believed concerning that important matter.

This method we uſefully employ againſt our Proteſtants. We make

it

it clearly out to them, that what we believe of the Euchariſt, the Sacrifice of the Maſs, the Invocation of Saints, prayer for the dead, and other controverted points, is the ancient Doctrine of the Church; and that ſo their belief contrary to ours being new, is falſe. We force them to acknowledge, that what they hold with us concerning *Infant Baptiſm*, the Baptiſm of Hereticks, and the change of the Sabbath into *Sunday*, of which Scripture makes no mention, they have it onely from Tradition, and the ancient Practice of the Church, and that therefore they reject the anabaptiſts, becauſe of the Novelty of their Doctrine.

And this is alſo the great Principle that the ancient Fathers made uſe of againſt the Hereticks of their times.

Let us onely conſult the order of time, ſaith Tertullian, *and we ſhall know that that which hath been firſt taught us, cometh from the Lord, and that it is truth; but that on the con-*

Ex ipſo ordine manifeſtatur id eſſe dominicum & verum, quod ſit prius traditum: id autem extraneum & falſum, quod ſit poſterius immiſſum. Tertull. *de præſcr. c.* 32.

contrary, what new thing hath ſince been introduced, cometh of the Stranger and is falſe.

Quis inter nos determinabit, niſi temporis ratio, ei præſcribens autoritatem quod antiquius reperietur, & ei præjudicans vitiationem quod poſterius revincetur? l. 4. cont. Marci. c. 4.

And in his fourth Book againſt *Marcion*: *Who can put an end to our differences, unleſs it be the order and deciſion of time, which Authorizes the Antiquity of Doctrine, and declares that defective which comes, not till after that ancient Belief?*

Upon the ſame ground St. *Jerome*, who flouriſhed about the end of the fourth Century, ſaid to one of his Adverſaries, who would have made a new Party in the Church: *Why do you offer after four hundred years, to teach us that which was not known before?*

Cur poſt quadringentos annos docere nos niteris quod ante neſcivimus? Hier. *Epiſt. ad* Pammach. *&* Ocean.

Pope *Celeſtin* I. Exhorting the *Gallican Church* to repreſs a ſort of People that would have eſtabliſhed new Doctrines, concludes with theſe very pithy words. *Let ſuch men be corrected; let them not have the liberty to ſay what they pleaſe; let not Novelty inſult over Antiquity.*

Corripiantur hujuſmodi: non ſit illis liberum habere pro voluntate ſermonem. Deſinat inceſſere novitas vetuſtatem. Cœleſt. *Ep. ad Epiſc. Gall.*

And *Sixtus* III. Animated by the

the ſame Spirit that his Predeceſſour was, and following his ſteps, ſpeaks to *John* of *Antioch* with the ſame force, writing to him in theſe terms: *Let no more be allowed to Novelty, becauſe nothing ought to be added to Antiquity.*

Nihil ultra liceat Novitati, quia nihil addi convenit vetuſtati. Six. III. *Ep. ad* Joan. Antioch.

Not but that the Church, which makes no new Articles of Faith, may declare after many Ages, being inſtructed by the Holy Ghoſt, which ſucceſſively teaches her all truth, that certain matters that have not been before examined, whether or not they be Articles of *Faith*, are really ſuch, as ſhe hath done upon many occaſions, obliging us to believe diſtinctly what was not as yet known to be matter of Faith. But that we ought ſo to ſtick to that which hath been believed in Antiquity, in matter of Doctrine, and eſpecially in the four or five firſt Ages, when, according to our Proteſtants themſelves; there was as yet no corruption in Doctrine, that new Doctours may add nothing of their own invention, nor eſtabliſh

bliſh any Novelty contrary to it. This ſolid Principle being equally received by Catholicks and Proteſtants, I hope to ſatisfie both, in declaring calmly and without diſpute, by the bare relation of evident matters of Fact, what the ancient Church hath believed concerning the eſtabliſhment of the Church of *Rome*, and the Prerogatives and rights of her Biſhops. This then is the Method which I ſhall trace in this Treatiſe.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the Foundation and Eſtabliſhment of the Church of Rome.

ALL Catholicks who know that the Popes are the Succeſſours of St. *Peter*, agree amongſt themſelves as to that point, but not with all Hereticks. For there are ſome Modern who confidently deny that that Divine Apoſtle ever was at *Rome*, or that he fixed his Chair either there or in the City of *Antioch*. They ground ſo extraordinary and new an Opinion upon the ſilence of St. *Luke* and St. *Paul*, who having been at *Rome*, would not have failed to have ſpoken of St. *Peter*, and to have found Chriſtians, if he had already Preached the Goſpel there; beſides, they ground it upon a certain Chronology which they have made, as they thought fit, of the Acts of the Apoſtles, and which can no way agree with that Hiſtory of St. *Peter*; and, in fine,

Calvin. l. 4. Inſt. c. 6.

fine, upon the very Epiſtles of that Apoſtle, who gives us to know that his Miſſion was into *Aſia*, and that he died at *Babylon*.

There is nothing that gives a clearer proof of the weakneſs and deluſion of the wit of man, than when, by that Pride, which is ſo natural to him, he ſhakes off that Authority to which he is obliged to ſubmit, and for that end, oppoſes it by his falſe reaſonings, that ſerve for no other purpoſe but to diſcover his blindneſs and vanity. Though we had elſewhere no Intelligence of the Voyage to, and *Chair* of St. *Peter* at *Rome*; yet no man of ſenſe would ſuffer himſelf to be perſuaded by ſuch inconcluſive arguments, ſo eaſie to be refuted. St. *Luke* ſays nothing of it in the Acts of the Apoſtles: Hath he mentioned there any thing of St. *Paul*'s Journey into *Arabia*, of his return to *Damaſcus*, and then three years after to *Jeruſalem*, of his Travels into *Galatia*, his being raviſhed up into Heaven, his three Shipwrecks, his eight Scourgings, and

and of a thouſand things elſe that he ſuffered? ſhall one conclude from that ſilence, that all is falſe? And though St. *Paul* had not written of theſe things himſelf, or if his Epiſtles to the *Galatians* and *Corinthians*, had never come to our hands, would that ſilence of St. *Luke* have been of any greater force, to prove that that is not true, ſeeing it is really ſo, and was true before St. *Paul* wrote any thing of it? That Evangeliſt, ſaith St. *Jerome* hath paſt over a great many things which St. *Paul* ſuffered, as likewiſe that St. *Peter* eſtabliſhed his Chair firſt at *Antioch*, and then at *Rome*.

Galat. 1. 2 *Cor.* 2.

In Ep. ad *Galat.* c. 2

And as to the Chronology calculated to refute the two Foundations of *Antioch* and *Rome*, we maintain that it is falſe; and it is eaſie to give another fixed by the ableſt writers of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory and Chronologers, which perfectly agrees with the Acts of the Apoſtles, and the Epiſtles of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*:

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

Paul: Take it thus then in a few words.

The year of our Lord thirty five; that Apoſtle was ſent with St. *John* to *Samaria*, to lay hands upon thoſe whom the Deacon St. *Philip* had newly converted there; And having Preached the Goſpel to the People of that Province, he returned to *Jeruſalem*, where St. *Paul*, three years after his Converſion, went to viſit him in the year thirty nine. Now ſeeing the Church at that time lived in a profound peace, St. *Peter* took ſo favourable a time to go viſit, as St. *Luke* ſaith in expreſs terms, all the Believers that the Diſciples diſperſed through the Provinces, during the Perſecution of the Jews, after the Martyrdom of St. *Stephen*, had gained to *Chriſt*.

Anno 35. *Act.* 8. v. 20.

Anno 39. *Galat.* 1. v. 18. *Act.* 9. v. 31, 32.

Act. 11. v. 19. Euſeb. *in Chron.* Chryſoſt. Hieron. Greg. M. *& alii.*

And then it was that being informed that many of theſe diſperſed Diſciples had by their Preaching wrought much fruit at *Antioch*, he went and ſetled his Patriarchal Chair in

in that great City the Capital of the Eaſt, as the Ancients aſſure us.

From thence; ſeeing he had the care of all the Churches, having given neceſſary orders for the government of that of *Antioch*, he returned into *Judæa*; viſits *Lidda*, *Joppa*, *Cæſarea*; opens a door to the calling of the Gentiles, by the Converſion of *Cornelius* the Centurion; and returns to *Jeruſalem*, where having declared what God had revealed to him upon that Subject, he was informed by the relation of thoſe that came from *Antioch*, that the number of Believers increaſed there dayly. And therefore St. *Barnabas* was ſent thither, who finding that there was a great Harveſt there, went to fetch St. *Paul* from *Tarſus* to aſſiſt him in the work; and both of them laboured in that holy employment for the ſpace of a whole year, with ſo great ſucceſs, that there the Believers, who were wonderfully increaſed in number, profeſſing publickly their faith in *Jeſus Chriſt*, true God and true Man, were firſt

Anno 40, 41.
Anno 42.
Act. 11. v. 4.
v. 22.
v. 25.
Anno 43.

called *Christians*. After that they carried to *Jerusalem*, where St. *Peter* was, and into all *Judæa* the Alms which they had collected from the fervent charity of these first Christians of *Antioch*, for the relief of the Poor during that great Famine which the Prophet *Agabus* foretold, and which was universal all over the world, the second year of the Empire of *Claudius*, and the four and fourtieth of *Jesus Christ*.

v. 30.

Act. 11.

Anno 44.

Dio. Cass. *l.* 60.

In the mean time *Herod Agrippa* whom that Emperour had the year before, sent home with freedom into his Kingdom of *Judæa*, caused the Apostle St. *James* Brother of St. *John* to be put to death before *Easter*; and that he might still more gain the affections of the Jews, mortal Enemies to the Christians, he cast St. *Peter* into Prison, to be served in the same manner after the Feast. But an Angel delivered him out of his hands, and brought him forth out of Prison. After that, this Apostle past by *Antioch* into the lesser *Asia*, where he spent most part of

Act. 12. v. 1.

Petr. *Epist. Metaph. ex Antiq.*

of that year, inſtructing the Believers, and erecting *Sees* in *Cappadocia*, *Galatia*, *Pontus* and *Bithynia*; And having from thence embarked for *Rome*, according to the orders he had received from the Holy Ghoſt, he arrived there about the end of that ſecond year of *Claudius*, as all the moſt ancient Authours who have written of St. *Peter* do agree.

In that capital City of the world, after he had converted a ſufficient number of Jews and Gentiles for founding a Church, he eſtabliſhed the year following, which was the fourty fifth of *Chriſt*, his Pontifical Chair, leaving that of *Antioch* to *Evodius*, and there he held it till the conſummation of his Martyrdom, that he ſuffered in the year threeſcore and nine, which was the thirteenth of the Empire of *Nero*. So that reckoning from the year thirty nine, to fourty five, we ſhall find that St. *Peter*'s See continued ſeven years at *Antioch*; and from fourty five to threeſcore and nine when he ſuffered Martyrdom,

Anno 45.

Anno 69.

we have the twenty five years of his Epiſcopacy at *Rome*.

Not that he lived there conſtantly during all that time, no more than he did at *Antioch*, all the ſeven years that he was Biſhop there. For ſeeing he was both an Apoſtle and a Biſhop, he travelled often, according to the Vocation of his Apoſtleſhip, into divers Countries of *Europe* and *Aſia*, there to plant Churches; and as Biſhop he governed his own, either Perſonally, or by his Vicars during his abſence: So that the quality of an Apoſtle is not at all inconſiſtent with that of a Biſhop: And if all Biſhops be not Apoſtles, all the Apoſtles were Biſhops, and ordained Biſhops; And for that reaſon it is that all theſe are the Succeſſours of the Apoſtles. St. *Peter* however, ſince no man before him had Preached the Goſpel at *Rome*, lived there ſeven years, untill the year fifty one, when he was forced to leave it becauſe of the Edict of the Emperour *Claudius*, who baniſhed thence the *Jews*.

Oroſ. *l.* 7. *c.* 6.

Sueton. *in* Claud.

That

That obliged him to return into *Aſia*; And it is certain that he was again at *Antioch*, where he had a great conteſt with St. *Paul*, either before, or after the Council of the Apoſtles, where he was preſent, and which was held the ſame year at *Jeruſalem*. *Act.* 18. v. 2. *Galat.* 2. v. 11.

Now ſeeing after that Council St. *Peter* could not return to *Rome* during the life of the Emperour who had baniſhed him thence, and that all the other Apoſtles almoſt, had had their Provinces in the Kingdoms of the Eaſt; he took that time to go Preach the Goſpel to the Nations of the Weſt, even thoſe moſt remote: For ſome have written that he went as far as *England*. So that when St. *Paul* wrote from *Corinth*, and not from *Raguſa* to the *Romans*, in the year fifty eight, and when next year after, he was carried Priſoner to *Rome*; where he continued two years, untill the year ſixty one, St. *Peter* was not as yet come back. So nothing can Metaph. *ex Antiq.* Orig. *præf. in Epiſt. ad* Rom. Theodor. *& alii.*

be concluded from the ſilence of St. *Paul*, who ſpeaks not of St. *Peter* no more than St. *Luke* does, who was with St. *Paul* at *Rome*.

And it cannot be ſaid that there were no Chriſtians in that City, when that Apoſtle arrived there, ſeeing he had written to them the year before an excellent Epiſtle, wherein he ſays, that their faith was ſpoken of throughout the whole world, and that he longed to ſee them, that he might impart to them ſome Spiritual Gifts, to the end they might be eſtabliſhed: which he adds, ſays *Theodoret*, and makes uſe of that word eſtabliſh, becauſe the great St. *Peter* had already Preached unto them the Doctrine of the Goſpel. Beſides that, when St. *Paul* arrived firſt at *Rome*, the Brethren came to meet him, as St. *Luke* mentions, who in many places of the *Acts* calls the Chriſtians by that name; and the chief men amongſt the Jews who came to wait upon him at his Lodging, asked him not what that Sect was,

Rom. 1. v. 8.

Theod. in Epiſt. ad Rom. c. 1.

Act. 28.

as

as if there had been no Chriſtians at *Rome*, and that they had not learned from them what their belief was, but what he believed, becauſe they ſaw that all who owned that Profeſſion were in all places oppoſed and contradicted. This is a Chronology exactly conform to the Scripture, and that very well agrees with the two Voyages of *Antioch* and *Rome*, which is the Queſtion in hand.

And as to what is objected to us, that St. *Peter* wrote from *Babylon*, where it is alſo affirmed that he died, there is nothing ſo pitifully weak. For it is ſo clear in that place that *Babylon* ſignifies the City of *Rome*, that that paſſage may even be uſed to prove by Scripture that St. *Peter* hath been at *Rome*. And indeed, it is by the very ſame that *Euſebius* makes it out that that Epiſtle was written at *Rome*; when he ſaith: *St.* Peter *makes it appear that he wrote it at* Rome, *when he calls that City* Babylon. Does not St. *Jerome* ſay the ſame, and after

1 *Pet.* c. 5. v. 13.

Euſeb. *Hiſt. l.* c. 74.

Hierom. *de ſcript. Eccl. in* Marc.

after him all those who have written upon that Epistle before the *Reformers*? But who knoweth not, that Ancient *Rome*, which according to the observation of St. *Austin*, was built at the same time when the Empire of the *Babylonians* was about to fall, is by the Ancients called *Babylon*, and especially that St. *John* in the Revelation gives it no other name when he speaks of it at the time when it Persecuted the Christians, and so cruelly shed the bloud of so many thousand Martyrs? And what is most pleasant, the Protestants are pleased to give to Christian *Rome* the name of *Babylon*; and are not satisfied that Pagan *Rome* should be so called by St. *Peter*.

Aug. *de civitat.* l. 18. c. 22. Oros. l. 7. c. 2. Tertul. *cont.* Marc. l. 3. c. 13.

Revel. 17.

That being presuppos'd, and all the weak batteries of our Adversaries so easily overthrown, I had reason to say, that if we knew not by other means, that St. *Peter* had been at *Rome*, yet all the reasons that are objected against it,

it, would never perſuade a Man of ſenſe of the contrary. How muſt it be then at preſent, when we have an invincible Argument to convince us of that truth which we ought never to abandon, even though we could not diſentangle our ſelves from the captious Arguments wherewith they aſſault us? For that can never proceed but from the weakneſs of our mind, and not the defect of the object, which, when it is once certainly known to be true, is neceſſarily ſo always.

What is that invincible Argument then, which ought to convince us of this truth? It is that which, as I have ſaid, I ſhall employ throughout this whole *Hiſtorical Treatiſe*, I mean Antiquity, according to that great Principle which at firſt I laid down; To wit, that that which is newly broached, if it be contrary to what hath been believed in the Primitive Church, is falſe, becauſe ancient belief, and that deſcends to us by Tra-

Tradition, especially when we trace it back to the age of the *Apostles*, is always truth it self.

Blondel *de la prim. en l'Eglise. Chap.* 32. *p.* 823.

Now all Antiquity hath believed, that St. *Peter* was at *Rome*: That is so true, that Mr. *David Blundel*, the most knowing of all our Protestant Ministers, frankly confesses it. And he must needs doe so; for being a Man of such parts, and so well read in the Ancients, as appears in his Works, he cannot deny, but that almost all the Latin and Greek Fathers have

Apud Prudent. *in peris. toph.*

asserted it; Amongst the Latins, *Prosper*, *Orosius*, St. *Augustine*, Saint *Jerome*, *Prudentius*, *Optatus*, Saint *Ambrose*, *Lactantius*, *Arnobius*, St. *Cyprian*, *Hippolytus*, *Tertullian*, and St. *Irenæus*; and amongst the Greeks, *Theodoret*, St. *Cyril of Alexandria*, St. *Chrysostom*, St. *Epiphanius*, St. *Cyril of Jerusalem*, St. *Athanasius*, *Peter* of *Alexandria*, *Eusebius*, *Origene*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Denis* of *Corinth*, *Cajus* contemporary with *Tertullian*, and *Papias* a disciple and hearer of St. *John*. Nor shall we

Apud Eusch. *l.* 2. *c.* 24.
Ibid.
Ibid. c. 13.

we mention all the other Writers, who, in all ſucceeding ages, have conſtantly aſſerted the ſame thing; inſomuch, that no Heretick nor Schiſmatick ever dreamt of calling it in queſtion, before our Proteſtants, who are the Authours of that impudent and unjuſtifiable novelty, which can never paſs with a Man of ſenſe, in oppoſition to all venerable Antiquity, and to the authority of ſo many great men, who have conſtantly, in all ages, given teſtimony to that truth, from our preſent times up to the age of the *Apoſtles*.

For to ſay, as ſome have done, That all the Fathers, and theſe Learned men have been deceived by an equivocal word, taking that part of the leſſer *Aſia*, where St. *Peter* Preached, for the City of *Rome*; and which, as the Geographer *Marius Niger* writes, was called *Rom.* *Rom. id eſt* Romanie, *ſive* Roma *appellatur. Pars vero quæ ad auſtrum eſt, in qua* Lycia, Pamphylia, *&* Cilicia *ſunt,* Otto-Manidia, *id eſt,* Familiæ Ottomani, *quibus illa ſucceſſit, quondam dicebantur.* Dominic. Marius Niger Venet. Aſiæ Pomment. 1. *de* Aſia Minore.

Quas omnes (*provincias*) *atas noſtrâ Anatoliam vocat. Unde apud Barbaros pars illa in qua* Aſia, Bithynia, Galatia, *&* Cappadocia prima,

or

or *Romania*; it is a ridiculous extravagance, and no leſs ſhamefull ignorance. It is onely the Turks, who, ſince they became Maſters of the Eaſtern Empire, have called the neighbouring Countrey to *Conſtantinople*, eſpecially beyond the *Boſphorus*, *Romania*, or *Rom.* or *Romelia*, as that Geographer ſays; for others give that name of *Romania*, or *Romelia*, onely to *Thrace*. This being ſo, Can it be affirmed, without diſgrace, that theſe holy Fathers, who flouriſhed many Ages, not onely before the Conqueſt of the Turks, but even before the founding of *Conſtantinople*, have been deceived, in imagining, that St. *Peter* was at *Rome*, becauſe it hath been ſaid, that he Preached in the Countrey of *Rom.*? See what extravagance they are capable of, who, to ſatisfie their paſſion, dare confront their ridiculous novelty with Antiquity, of which we may ſay with Pope *Celeſtine* I. *Deſinat incedere novitas vetuſtatem.*

CHAP. III.

CHAP. III.

That the Church of Rome *hath been founded by St.* Peter; *that he was the firſt Biſhop of it; and that the Popes are his Succeſſours therein.*

IT will not be difficult to confirm the truth of this by the ſame principle of Antiquity, to which I confine my ſelf in this Treatiſe. For all the ſame Fathers almoſt, and ancient Authours, who aſſure us that Saint *Peter* was at *Rome*; ſay alſo, that he founded that particular Church. It is true, that many of them joyn St. *Paul* with him in that function, as it is done at preſent; and there is reaſon for ſo doing, becauſe both of them Preached the Goſpel there, in different times, and both at the ſame time Conſecrated that illuſtrious Church by their Martyrdom. But when they ſpeak, as they very often do, of the Epiſcopacy and Chair of *Rome*, they call it ſolely the Chair of St. *Peter*, without joining St. *Paul* with

Cyprian. *ad* Corn. *Ep.* 55. *& lib. de unit.* Optat. *Conf.* Parm. *l.* 2. Ambroſ. *de Sacr. l.* 3. *c.* 1. Hierom. *de Script. in* Petr. *& alibi.* Hegeſip. *apud* Hier. *de Script.* Ruffin. *in verſ.* Sulp. Sever. *Hiſt. Sacr. l.* 2. Auguſt. *contra* Petil. *l.* 2. *c.* 51.

with him. So that it is not to be doubted, but that all Antiquity hath acknowledged St. *Peter*, of all the Apoſtles, to have been the firſt Biſhop of *Rome*, as Mr. *Blondel* confeſſes.

De la Primauté en l'Egliſe. p. 44.

So alſo when *Optatus Meleuitanus*, St. *Jerome*, St. *Auſtin*, and the reſt, give a Catalogue of the Biſhops of *Rome*, they place always St. *Peter* firſt, and bring them down to him that poſſeſſed the See in their time, to ſhew the uninterrupted Succeſſion of Popes from St. *Peter*, whoſe lawfull Succeſſours they are, and whoſe Chair they fill, as the holy Fathers and Councils frequently ſay.

Hilar. in Frag. p. 23. Cypr. Ep. 43. Optat. contra Parm. l. 1.

I know there are ſome who have ſaid, That Biſhops, being the Succeſſours of the Apoſtles, are in that quality all of them in St. *Peter*'s Chair. We ſay the ſame alſo, and it muſt needs be granted, for the reaſon that I ſhall alledge, according to one of the Principles which I laid down at firſt, in the firſt Chapter of this *Treatiſe*.

As

As the Univerſal Church is one, and a body conſtituted of all particular Churches, in union with one principal or chief Church, the principle and centre of their unity: So there is but one general Chair in the Church, and one Epiſcopacy, compoſed of all the Epiſcopal Chairs, by the communication which they have with the *Head* of that Church, and with that chief Chair whence their unity proceeds. So that, as all Believers are members of the ſame Church, when they are united to its *Head*; ſo all Biſhops, taken in general, and every one in particular, ſit in the ſame Chair, by the communion which they have with him that ſits in that principal Chair, from whence, by that union which they preſerve with it, reſults the unity of the Chair and of Epiſcopacy in the Church.

Cathedra una ſuper Petrum Domini voce fundata. Cypr. *Epiſt.* 40. Optat. *contra Parmen. l.* 2.

But, beſides that, every one of them hath his particular Chair, wherein none of the reſt have any ſhare, as they have all a ſhare in that Chair which is but one in the Univerſal Church. And becauſe

Saint *Peter* is head of it, as we shall presently make it appear, not onely his particular Chair of *Rome*, but likewise that of the whole Church is by the holy Fathers often called the Chair of St. *Peter*. It is in that sense then, that all Bishops sit in St. *Peter's* Chair, as all the Doctours of the old Law sate in the Chair of *Moses*. But for all that, all Bishops sit not in St. *Peter's* particular Chair, no more than his Successours in that Chair, sit in the Chairs of other Bishops, every one possessing entirely his own, as a part of the Universal Episcopacy. And thus also is to be understood what is said, that all Bishops are the Successours of St. *Peter*. Take it in this manner.

I have clearly made it out in my *Treatise* of the true Church, even according to *Calvin*, and the ablest of our Protestants, that the true mark of the true Church, which distinguishes her from all others, is the perpetuity that will make her continue, without ever failing, to the end

of

of the World. And ſeeing ſhe is that great Sheep-fold, wherein all believers, who are the ſheep of *Jeſus Chriſt*, are gathered together into one flock, ſhe cannot ſubſiſt in that unity without there be Paſtours and Sheep; ſome to teach, and others to receive the truths which they are to believe: guides, and people, to be guided: and unleſs theſe paſtours and guides ſucceed one another, without interruption to the end, for governing and guiding believers.

Now that is not to be ſeen but in the Catholick Church, by the Union that all theſe particular Churches and their Biſhops have with him whom they own for their *Head*. For in what time ſoever theſe Churches began to be planted, ſome ſooner, ſome later, they may aſcend, by virtue of that Union, through a perpetual Succeſſion, from Paſtours to Paſtours, and from Biſhops to Biſhops, till they come to him whom *Jeſus Chriſt* hath given them for *Head*. And becauſe St. *Peter* is he, as we ſhall preſently ſee; it is evi-

dent, that it is by that that they are his Succeſſours; ſince by the Union which they have with the Biſhop of *Rome* their Head, who, in a ſtreight line, ſucceeds to St. *Peter*, they mount up, without interruption, by a continuity and collateral Succeſſion, even to that *Apoſtle*, as all the branches of a Tree are united to the root in oblique and indirect lines, by the union with the trunk and body of that Tree. But we muſt now conſider the rights and prerogatives of St. *Peter*, who was the firſt Biſhop of *Rome*.

CHAP. IV.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Primacy of St, Peter, *and that he hath been eſtabliſhed by* Jeſus Chriſt *head of the Univerſal Church.*

I Shall not enlarge in a long diſcuſſion of this point, which the great and large volumes that ſo many learned men of the paſt and preſent age have compoſed for clearing of it, have drained, in alledging all that ſolidly can be ſaid, as to this Article of our Faith, on which depends that perfect unity, which we avow to be eſſential to the Church. I ſhall onely ſay what all Catholicks agree in, that *Jeſus Chriſt* choſe St. *Peter*, amongſt all his *Apoſtles*, to give him, not onely the Primacy of order, honour and rank, by aſſigning him the firſt place, as one chief in dignity amongſt his equals; and in thoſe gifts, talents and graces which are inſeparable from the Apoſtleſhip and Epiſcopacy; but alſo the Primacy of Juriſdiction,

Power and Authority over all believers in the whole Church, of whom he appointed him head.

This they learn from the *Gospel*, in that famous passage of the sixteenth Chapter of St. *Matthew*, where St. *Peter*, having answered for all the *Apostles* to our Saviour, who had asked them, what they thought of him, *Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God:* our heavenly Lord, commending his faith, said to him, *Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my father which is in heaven. And I say unto thee that thou art Cephas* (that is to say, in the Syriack Tongue, a *Stone*) *and upon this rock I will build my Church: and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the Keyes of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.*

Most of the holy Fathers, especially those that were before the Coun-

cil

cil of *Nice*, interpret to the perſon of St. *Peter*, theſe words, *and upon that rock I will build my Church*; according to the reference that they muſt neceſſarily have to theſe which go before, *I ſay unto thee that thou art Cephas*, that is to ſay a *Stone or Rock*. There are others, particularly ſince the Council of *Nice*, who, to confute the impiety of the *Arians*, have underſtood them of that illuſtrious confeſſion of Faith that St. *Peter* made, when he ſaid, *Thou art the Chriſt, the Son of the living God*; and ſome have referred them to *Jeſus Chriſt* himſelf, who is the foundation and corner Stone, of which St. *Paul* ſaith, That no man can lay another than that which is already laid, which is *Jeſus Chriſt*.

But beſides, that the ſame Authours ſay elſewhere, that the Church is founded on St. *Peter*, it is eaſie to reconcile all theſe opinions together, which, without any difficulty, may be reduced to one, that reſults from all the three, by ſaying, that theſe words ought to be underſtood of the

Tertul. *de præſcr. c.* 32.
Origen. *in Ep.* 14. *hom.* 5.
Cypr. *Epiſt.* 71. *p.* 73. *ad* Jabaium.
Hilar. *lib.*6. *de Trinit.*
Greg. Niſſ. *in opera de adv. Domini.*
Ambroſ. *in cap.* 2. *Ep. ad* Eph.
Chryſoſt. *in* Matt. 15. 83. *& in cap.* 1. *Ep. ad* Gal.
Hier. *in* Matth. *c.*6.
Auguſt. *in* Joan. *Tract.* 124.

perſon of St. *Peter*, confeſſing *Jeſus Chriſt* to be the Son of the living God. It is evident, that theſe three interpretations naturally reſolve into this, which comprehends the Faith of the Divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt*, the confeſſion of that Faith, and the perſon who made that confeſſion.

Now ſeeing the Church is the Society of true Chriſtians, and that the firſt object of the Faith of Chriſtians, as *Chriſtians*, is *Jeſus Chriſt*; by the ſame it is, that *Jeſus Chriſt* is the firſt foundation of the Church, and that no other than he can be laid, for grounding and eſtabliſhing the Faith of Chriſtianity.

Epheſ. 2.

Moreover, as it is not enough to be a true Chriſtian, to believe in *Jeſus Chriſt*, and to preſerve that Faith in the heart, if we do not alſo confeſs that we believe in him: therefore it is that the Church again is founded upon the confeſſion of the Divinity of *Chriſt*.

Rom. 11.

In fine, beſides *Faith* and the publick profeſſion of it, the Church alſo, which is the Kingdom of *Jeſus Chriſt*, muſt

muſt be well governed. For that purpoſe, he hath appointed in it *Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, Paſtours and Teachers*, that they may labour in perfecting the Saints, according to the functions of their Miniſtery, *for edifying of the body of Jeſus Chriſt.* And thence it is, that becauſe of that illuſtrious confeſſion of the Divinity of the Son of God, which St. *Peter* made in name of all the *Apoſtles*, he eſtabliſhed him the foundation of the Miniſtery and Government of the Church, by giving him the overſight and authority over all the reſt, who are ſubordinate to him, in their functions and inferiour Miniſteries, as to their *Head.* Wherefore *Jeſus Chriſt* immediately after ſaid to him, giving him that ſupream power and authority in his Church. *I will give unto thee the Keyes of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou ſhalt bind upon earth, ſhall be bound in heaven; and whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe upon earth, ſhalt be looſed in heaven.* And that promiſe, which could not fail of being accompliſhed, was then fulfilled;

Epheſ. 4. v. 11. 12.

led, when the Son of God, after his resurrection, said to him thrice, *Feed my sheep.*

John 20.

I know, that according to the sentiment of the Fathers, and principally of St. *Augustine*, he spake these words unto him, as to one who was the Figure of the Church, with relation to all the *Apostles*, and their Successours the Bishops, who are also the foundations and pillars of the Church, according to St. *Paul*, and to whom *Jesus Christ* hath said, that whatsoever they shall bind upon Earth, shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever they shall loose upon Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven. But there is this difference betwixt Saint *Peter* and all the rest, that when he speaks to all in common, he gives them that which is common to all the *Apostles*, and wherein they are all equal, as the power of administring Sacraments, teaching all Nations, baptizing, forgiving sins, and what belongs to the other Apostolical functions. And when he applies himself particularly to Saint *Peter*,

Cypr. *Ep.* 27. *de Lapſ.*
Hier. *l.* 1. *cont.* Jovin.
Auguſt. *Con.* 2. *in* Pſal. 30. *& in* Pſal. 86.

Peter, he gives him that which is proper to himself, speaking to him in the singular number, for setling in his Church, the unity whereof he makes him the principle and foundation, to which all the rest must have a reference, that they may be but one, by the union which they ought necessarily to have with their *Head*, without which they neither are, nor can doe any thing.

Cypr. *lib. de unit. Eccles. Ep.* 55. *&* 73. Hieronym. *adv.* Jovinian *l.*2. Optat. *cont.* Parmen. *l.* 2.

For as St. *Peter* was the first that publickly confessed the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*, which he had by revelation, and that the rest knew it not but by his means, and that they answered onely by his mouth, joyning with him on that great occasion: So *Jesus Christ*, in consideration of that primacy of Confession, hath given him the primacy over all the rest, making him their *head*, and that *one*, that original, foundation and principle of unity, upon which he hath built the Church, in regard of its government. So that although all the rest received immediately

diately from *Chriſt* the power of binding and looſing, and of governing their Churches, yet they cannot exerciſe it but by virtue of the union which they have with St. *Peter*, without which they would continue no longer in unity, nor by conſequent in the Church. And it is upon that that the Primacy of Saint *Peter* is founded, and that he is next to *Jeſus Chriſt*, and not as he is, by his own power and virtue, but by commiſſion, the foundation and head of the Church.

The Proteſtants, who, by a deplorable Schiſm, not without Hereſie, have gone out of the unity of the Church, by making ſeparation from the Chair of St. *Peter*, which is the principle, original and centre thereof; have, in vain, diſputed this Doctrine, with all their force, untill this preſent. I ſhall not here undertake a refutation of their objections, whereby they pretend to overthrow it, and whereof the weakneſs hath been made appear, in a vaſt number of great and learned Anſwers that have

have been made to them. But to avoid diſputing, which is unſeparable from the oppoſing of arguments to arguments, for refuting adverſaries; and that I may onely make uſe of that great maxime, which alone I am to employ in this *Treatiſe*, I ſhall onely ſay in one word, that if we conſult Antiquity, we ſhall find, by tracing it to the firſt Ages of the Church, that it hath ever conſtantly believed that Primacy of St. *Peter*.

This is eaſily proved by the teſtimonies of almoſt all the holy Fathers, who, in an infinite number of places in their Works, ſay, That he is the Rock and Foundation of the Church; that his Chair is the chief Chair, to which all the reſt muſt unite; that he hath the Supreme power to take care of the flock of the Son of God; that he hath received the Primacy, to the end that the Church might be one; that he is the firſt, the chief and the head of the *Apoſtles*; that he is the inſpectour of all the Univerſe; he, to whom

Hippolyt. *Martyr. de conſum. mundi.* Tertul. *de præſ. c.* 22. Iren. Origen *in Ep. ad* R. *c.* 6. Cypr. *lib. de unit. Eccl.* Epiph. *in* Anchor. Amb. *in* Luc. *c.* 10. Greg. Naz. *or.* 26. Hilar. *in* Matth. *c.* 16. Hier. *adv.* Jovin. *l.* 2. Optat. Melev. *cont.* Parmen. *l.* 2. Cyrill. Alex. *in* Joan. *c.* 12. Auguſt. *in* Joan. *tr.* 11. 36. *Ep.* 161.

Chryſoſt. *hom.* 13. *in* Matth. *in* Joan. *hom.* 87. *de beat.* Ignat. *St.* Leo, *Serm. in Anniverſar. ſu. Aſſumpſit.*

whom *Jeſus Chriſt* hath committed the diſpoſition of all things, to whom he hath given the rule over his brethren, who is preferred before all the *Apoſtles*, and who governs all Paſtours; with many other *encomiums* of that nature, all which magnificently expreſs his Primacy; and which have been often repeated and approved in General Councils.

And that ſupereminent dignity of St. *Peter* was ſo well known, even of the Pagans, in Antiquity, that *Porphyrius*, one of their greateſt Philoſophers, upbraided the Chriſtians, as St. *Jerome* informs us, that their St. *Paul* was ſo raſh, as to have darſd to reprove the Prince of the *Apoſtles*, and his Maſter. Since then all venerable Antiquity hath believed the Primacy of St. *Peter*, which our Proteſtants conteſt by the novelty of their Doctrine, we have reaſon, once more, to ſay to them, *Deſinat inceſſere novitas vetuſtatem.*

Hieron. Ep. 89.

After

After all, it is ſo evident, that *Jeſus Chriſt*, who will have his Church to continue to the end of the World, hath given St. *Peter* the Primacy and Supreme dignity of viſible Head of the Church, for himſelf and Succeſſours, in that Principal Chair which that great *Apoſtle* fixed at *Rome*, that it would be ſuperfluous to attempt to prove it. For if it had been ſo confined to his Perſon, that it deſcended not to his Succeſſours, it would follow, that after the death of St. *Peter*, the Church was fallen, that it had no longer that Principle of unity, which makes it one; that it was no more but a body without a head, and a ruinous building without a foundation. Beſides, Is it not well known that it is an order naturally fixed in lawfull Succeſſions, that Kings and other Princes, and their Officers, in the Civil State; Biſhops, Metropolitans, Primates and Patriarchs, nay, and Miniſters amongſt our Proteſtants, ſucceed to the rights and powers of their Predeceſſours?

But

But though we had no ſuch convincing reaſons, yet it would be enough to ſay, that all the ſame evidences of Antiquity that have given teſtimony to the Primacy of St. *Peter*, and to his ſupreme power in the Univerſal Church, have alſo by common conſent attributed it, upon the ſame words of *Jeſus Chriſt*, to the Biſhops of *Rome*, who are the Succeſſours of the Prince of Apoſtles. There is nothing more ordinary in the Councils and Fathers, where the ſame things that are ſaid of the Primacy of St. *Peter*, and of the Prerogatives of his Chair at *Rome*, are in formal terms moſt frequently found repeated to expreſs the Primacy of the Popes, their ſuper-intendance in the Univerſal Church, and the ſuperiority of their Chair, and of the Church of *Rome*, to which they declare that all the reſt ought to be united as Lines to their Centre, and as to the ſource of Sacerdotal Unity. And that's the reaſon why we call the Univerſal Church, the Roman-Catholick and Apoſtolick Church,

Concil. Sardic. *Ep. ad* Jul. *in frag.* Hil. *Con. Conſtant. ad* Dam. *Conc. Epheſ. Conc.* Calcedon *ad Leon. Conc. 6. Act* 18. *Ep. ad* Agath. Iren. *l.* 3. *cont.* Valent. Cyprian. *ad* Corn. *Ep.* 55. *& l. de unitat.* Optat. *contra* Parm. *l.* 2. Vincent. *Lirin. lib. contra* Hær. *c.* 3. Hier. *ad* Dam. Auguſt. *de duab. Ep. Pelag. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *& Ep.* 92. 162. Chryſoſt. *Ep.* 1. *ad* Innoc. Proſper. *de voc. gent. l.* 8. *c.* 6. *St.* Leo. *St.* Gregor. Theodoret. Socrates. Sozom. *& alii paſſim.*

Church, becauſe all particular Churches, of which that great body is conſtituted, muſt be united in communion with the Pope of *Rome* their Head, that ſo they may be Members of the true Church of Jeſus Chriſt, which is no ways *one*, but by that union which maketh its perfect unity.

~~I have, me thinks, made it hitherto~~ clear enough, according to all Antiquity oppoſite to the novelty of our Proteſtants, what is the belief of Catholicks concerning St. *Peter* and of his Succeſſours in his Biſhoprick of *Rome*. We muſt now in order examine, ſticking cloſe to Antiquity againſt all Novelty, what Prerogatives and Rights that Primacy gives to Popes, what it is that all Catholicks agree in, and wherein it is that they differ about that point; and prove by uncontroverted matters of Fact, without diſputation, what Antiquity, which

ought to direct our belief, in ſpight of all the attempts of Novelty, hath believed concerning points of that importance.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the rights and advantages that the Primacy gives to the Biſhop of Rome *over all other Biſhops.*

I Think that point cannot better be decided than by the Decree of the Council of *Florence* in the year 1439. when that famous re-union was made betwixt the Latin and Greek Churches, after many celebrated conferences and great conteſts that happened there during the ſpace of fifteen months, betwixt the learneſt men of both Churches about that Subject and other controverted points. This is the definition of the Council. *Item, we define that the Holy Apoſtolick See, and the Pope of* Rome *have the Primacy over all the world; that the Pope of* Rome *is the Succeſſour of St.* Peter *Prince of the Apoſtles; that he is the true Vicar of Jeſus Chriſt, and Head of all the Church, the Fa-*

ther and Teacher of all Christians; and that our Lord Jesus Christ hath given him, in the person of St. Peter, full power of feeding, ruling and governing the universal Church, in the manner specified in the Acts of Councils, and holy Canons.

For it is precisely so in the Greek, Καθ' ὃν τρόπον καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρακτικοῖς τῶν οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς κανόσι διαλαμβάνεται, and in the Latin, *Juxta eum modum qui & in Actis Conciliorum & in Sacris Canonibus continetur*: As it is to be read in *Blondus* Secretary to Pope *Eugenius*, who presided in that Council. In *Ekius* his Treatise of the Primacy of the Pope, in the Bishop of *Rochester*'s five and twentieth Article against *Luther*, and in *Albertus Pighius* his fourth Book of the Hierarchy. That is to say in English, *To govern the Church in the manner which is found expressed in the Acts of the Councils, and in the Holy Canons*; not as *Abraham* of *Candie* hath very ill rendered it, *quemadmodum etiam*, which gives it a quite contrary sense

Decad. 3. l. 10.

Lib. 1.

Cap. Ult.

to

to the intention and words of the Council, as will manifestly appear in another place of this Treatise.

At present it is enough that we know, according to that Council, that the Primacy of the Pope entitles him to the inspection of all that concerns the government and welfare of the Church in general, which is more than any Bishop of what dignity soever he may be can challenge. For the power that other Bishops have by Divine Right to govern the Church, reaches not beyond their Dioceses: but that of the Pope, as Head of the Church Universal, extends every where, when the good of all Believers in general is concerned, of whom he is to take the care. And that supreme dignity gives him a great many rights, which none but he alone can enjoy.

To him application is made to have resolutions in difficulties that may arise in matters concerning *Faith*, manners, or general Customs.

Hieron. *ad* Aggruch. *Ep.* 2.
Innoc. 1. *apud* Aug. *Epist.* 93.
August. *Epist.* 106.
Jul. *apud* Athan, *Apol.* 1.

Of this we have evident proofs in the Holy Fathers, and an illustrious instance of it hath been seen in our days, in that famous letter which the Bishops of *France* wrote to Pope *Innocent* X.

He alone hath the right of calling Councils for Spiritual Affairs, and to preside in them personally, or by his Legates. I say he hath that right, without speaking of matter of Fact, which is under debate in respect of some Councils, and can not prejudice his Primacy. For though he hath not presided in the first Council of *Constantinople*, which perhaps neither did he call, and that it be most certain that he did not call the fifth, nor presided in it, though he was at *Constantinople*, where that Council was held: yet it is not to be doubted but he might have done both the one and the other, if he had pleased, seeing that in the Letter which the Patriarch *Eutychius* wrote to him for obtaining of that Council, he prayed him to preside in it, and that

Concil. 5. Act. 1.

that he onely preſided therein upon his refuſal. For thus it is in the Original, *preſidente nobis veſtrâ beatitudine*, and not *reſidente nobiſcum*, as the Miniſter *Junius* hath corrupted it, by a correction made of his own head, againſt the clear ſenſe of the following words.

Beſides, is it not paſt all controverſie that the Pope preſided by his Legates in the Council of *Chalcedon*, as he hath done in almoſt all the others which have been held ſince? For I ſpeak not here of the great Council of *Nice*, nor of that of *Epheſus*, becauſe, as I conceive, I have elſewhere proved by invincible Arguments, not onely againſt our Proteſtants, but alſo againſt the ſentiments of ſome Catholick Doctours, that the Popes by their Legates preſided in them, nay, and that they called them, as to what relates to the Spiritual Authority which they have over the Biſhops; as the Emperours, to whoſe rights *Kings* and Chriſtian *Princes* have ſucceeded, may call

Councils in regard of *Temporals*, by that ſovereign power which they have received from God over their Subjects, in virtue whereof they may oblige their Biſhops to aſſemble in a certain place, either within or without their Territories, there to treat of matters purely ſpiritual, wherein they meddle not, but as protectours of the Church, in cauſing the Decrees and Canons of theſe Councils which ſtrike not at the Rights of their Crown, to be put in execution. It is certain then that the Popes, as Heads of the Church, have right to call general Councils, and to preſide in them.

Moreover, ſeeing the Pope in that quality, is without diſpute, above every Biſhop of what Dignity ſoever he may be, and above all particular Churches and Synods: Appeals may be made from all theſe Biſhops and Synods to his Tribunal. It belongs to him to judge of greater Cauſes, ſuch as thoſe which concern the *Faith*, and that are doubtfull, univerſal Cuſtoms,

Concil. Sardic. *Can.* 3. 4. 7.
Gelaſ. *Epiſt. ad Epiſ.* Dardan.
Innoc. *Epiſt. ad* Victric.
St. Leo. *Ep.* 82.
Cap. Car. Mag. *lib.* c. 187.
Hincmar. *ad* Nicol. 1.
Flodo. *Hiſt. Eccl.* Rom. *l.* 3.
Gerſon *de Proteſtant. Eccl. Conſ.* 8.

Cuſtoms, the depoſing of Biſhops, and ſome others which I have obſerved elſewhere, the deciſion whereof belongs and ought to be referred to him. In that manner the Inferiour Judges appointed by *Moſes* according to the advice of *Jethro*, judged of cauſes of leſs importance, and the greater were reſerved to that great leader of the People of God.

Exod. 18.

Hence it is alſo that the Pope hath right to judge, yet always according to the diſpoſition of the Canons, of the cauſes of Biſhops, Metropolitans, Primates and Patriarchs. This appears clearly by the judgment in the caſe of St. *Athanaſius*, *Paul* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, *Marcellus* Primate of *Ancyra*, *Aſclepas* Biſhop of *Gaza*, and *Lucius* Biſhop of *Adrianople*: whom Pope *Julius* reſtored to their *Sees*, from which they had been illegally Depoſed; and by the caſe of *Denis* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, who being accuſed, defended himſelf in writing before the

Athan. *Apol.* 2. Theodoret. *l.* 2. Socr. *l.* 2. *c.* 15. Sozom. *l.* 3. *c.* 81.

Athan. *de ſent.* Dionyſ.

the Pope; in a word, by an infinite number of other instances in all ages of the Church, which may be seen in my Treatise of the judgment of the causes of Bishops. I shall onely mention one which wonderfully sets off that supreme Authority of the Pope.

Liberat. c. 10. After the death of *Epiphanius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, the Empress *Theodora*, one of the wickedst Women that ever was, and above all a great *Eutychian* in her heart, and a great enemy to the Council of *Chalcedon*, prevailed so far, by the great power that she had got over the mind of the Emperour *Justinian* her Husband, who could not resist her Artifices, that *Anthimius* was made Patriarch, though he was Bishop of *Trebizonde*, by that means possessing at the same time two Episcopal Chairs, against the manifest constitution of the holy Canons, without any Precedent, and without lawfull dispensation.

Besides,

Besides, that naughty man was both a stark Heretick, and great Cheat. For though he was not only *Eutychian*, but also the head of those Hereticks, yet he always professed, that he might deceive the Emperour, who at that time was a good Catholick, that he received the Doctrine of the four Councils, but without ever condemning *Eutyches*, who had been condemned by the holy Council of *Chalcedon*. That occasioned a great deal of scandal and trouble in the *East*, and seeing, when matters were in this state; St. *Agapetus* the Pope was come from *Rome* to *Constantinople*, whither *Theodatus* King of the *Goths* had obliged him to go, that he might endeavour to obtain of *Justinian* the peace which the *Goths* demanded; The Monks of *Syria*, and many other zealous Catholicks presented him Petitions against that Intruder and Heretick.

Justin. *Nov.* 42. Niceph. *l.* 17. *c.* 9.

Concil. Constant. *sub* Men. *Act.* 1.

This without doubt is one of the most illustrious marks, and one of the strongest proofs of the Authority

rity of the Holy *See*, and of the Primacy of the Pope, that ever was seen in the Church. The Emperour who loved *Anthimius*, and thought himself obliged in honour to protect him, as being his Creature, solicited on his behalf; and by his earnestness in the Affair, made it apparent that he intended to maintain him. *Theodora* who was more concerned still than the Emperour in the preservation of her Patriarch, employed all her Artifices, and spared neither offers, prayers nor threats, to shake the constancy of a Pope whom she saw resolved to make use of the power which he had received from *Jesus Christ* for the good of the Church.

The Empire was then in a most flourishing state, the Emperour shining in glory. After the defeat of the *Vandals* in *Africa*; *Constantinople* in great splendour; *Anthimius* most powerfull through the favour of his Prince, and the Grandeur and Majesty of the Patriarchal *See* of the Imperial City, where he

he thought himſelf too well fixed, to fear that he could be turned out. *Rome* on the contrary being no more the Seat of the Empire, ſince it was fallen under the Dominion of the *Herules* and *Goths*; retained now nothing that was great, beſides its own ruines and name. The Church of *Rome* Tyrannically oppreſt by theſe *Barbarians*, was, if I dare ſay ſo, in the chains of the *Oſtrogoths*, who uſed it like a ſlave. The Pope forced to comply under the haughty commands of *Theodatus*, who ſent him to negotiate his affairs in the Eaſt, ſo little eſteemed by that *Barbarian*, and ſo poor, that he was obliged to ſell the Plate of his Church, to raiſe money for this Voyage, was almoſt all alone at *Conſtantinople*, without a Court, without Cardinals, without Train, without Equipage, without ſupport, and onely upheld by his ſpiritual power, which was not backed by any of thoſe glorious marks, that at preſent renders the Pontifical Majeſty ſo venerable to all the world. Ne-

Nevertheleſs in that condition he pronounces two thundering ſentences againſt the Patriarch *Anthimius*: one upon the ſpot, whereby by reaſon of his manifeſt intruſion, he depoſes him from his Patriarchſhip, and puts the Prieſt *Mennas* in his place, whom he himſelf conſecrated Biſhop and Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*; and the other ſhortly after, for the Crime of Hereſie, of which he was ſtrongly ſuſpected guilty, ordaining that if he cleared himſelf not of it, by obeying the holy Canons, he ſhould alſo be depoſed from his Biſhoprick of *Trabizonde*.

Con. ſub Men. *Act.* 4. Marcell. *in* Chron. *Liber in Brev. c.* 2. Vict. Tun. *in* Chron.

And ſeeing the holy Pope died the ſame year, that ſentence was the year following put in execution, in a Councel held by *Mennas* at *Conſtantinople*; where becauſe *Anthimius* would never condemn *Eutyches*, he was deprived of the Biſhoprick of *Trabizonde*, and of all ſacerdotal Dignity, according to the ſentence of the Pope.

Anno 537.

Concil. ſub Men. *Act.* 4.

And

And which is ſtill more wonderfull, *Juſtinian* acknowledging that Supreme Authority of the Pope, to which he ſubmitted and joyning thereto his own, as Protectour of the Canons, for cauſing that to be put in execution, made againſt *Anthimus* that famous conſtitution, which is to be ſeen in his two and fourtieth *Novel*, in the tenth collation of his Authenticks, wherein he poſitively ſays that he hath been juſtly Depoſed by the Pope, as well becauſe he had intruded, contrary to the Holy Canons, into the Chair of *Conſtantinople*, as that he would not condemn thoſe who had been Condemned by Councils. Was there ever a more admirable effect of the Spiritual Power and Authority of the Vicar of Jeſus Chriſt?

Neque ipſe abdicare auctores impiorum dogmatum, qui prius à Sanctis Synodis percuſſi fuerant.
Inſt. Nov. 42.

But before I conclude, I muſt, upon occaſion of this Council of *Conſtantinople* under *Mennas*, ſhew the Prodigious ignorance of *Calvin*, in relation to the Hiſtory of the Ancient Church. I have ſaid in

in the Hiſtory of *Calviniſm*, and I ſay it again that that man having never entered the Schools of Divinity, underſtood nothing at all in that Sacred Science; which is a Key abſolutely neceſſary for unlocking the ſentiments and ſentences of the Holy Fathers, that contain the Principles of true Theology; as they are to be found in a lovely order in the Maſter of Sentences. But it is to be confeſſed that his ignorance appears incomparably more pitifull, when he undertakes to prove his new Opinions by *Church* Hiſtory, in which he was never verſed. Take this as an evident proof of it.

This Innovatour, who ſtrikes chiefly at the Primacy of the Pope, ſays in that place, for overthrowing it, that *Mennas* preſided in the fifth Council, and that the Pope being called to it, did not conteſt with him about the place of Honour, but without difficulty ſuffered

Calvin. *Inſt. l.4.c.7.*

ſuffered the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* to preſide therein. Ridiculous miſtake! *Mennas* was dead long before the fifth Council was called, which was held in the Seven and twentieth year of the Empire of *Juſtinian*, as *Calvin*, had he ever read the Councils, might have learned from the ſixth Ecumenick Council, third Action. How then could that dead man have preſided in that Council, which was not held till five or ſix years after his death, under his Succeſſour *Eutychius*?

Conſil. 6. Act. 3.

Now if it be alledged, for excuſe of that miſtake, that *Calvin*, by that Council, means the other which was held by *Mennas*, yet that makes him but ſtill ridiculous. For, beſides, that that particular Council is very different from that which is called the Fifth, and which holds that rank amongſt the General Councils: the onely Pope that was at *Conſtantinople*, in the time of *Mennas*, to wit, St. *Agapetus* was dead before that Council, wherein

Act. 4. *Mennas* calls him, his Father of holy and blessed memory.

And had that Pope been still alive, How durst *Mennas* have pretended to the first place in his presence, he, whom that Pope had made Patriarch, who protests in the same Council, that he is subject to the Holy *See*, and who knows the thoughts of the Emperour *Justinian*, that declares publickly, That the Pope is the Head of all the holy Prelates of God, and who will have his Patriarch of New *Rome* to have the next place to the holy Apostolick *See* of Old *Rome*? So that to what side soever *Calvin* turn, he shall always find his Man dead in stead of alive. And as it is very well known, that God favour'd him not with the gift of working Miracles, he can never raise him again, to place him there where nothing but his extreme ignorance could put him.

'Ως κεφαλῆ τῶν ἁπάντων τῶν θείων ἱερέων. Cod. l. 7.

Novel. 131.

By the same defect of knowledge, accompanied with a ridiculous boldness, that he may strip the Pope of his

his Primacy, he takes *Nice* in *Thracia*, for *Nicæa* in *Bithynia*; Pope *Julius* for *Silveſter*; the firſt place for the laſt, in citing *Sozomene*, who, beginning by this Man, in the enumeration of the Patriarchs, aſcends, in order, to the firſt, where he puts the Legats of the Pope, ſpeaking of the firſt Council, wherein, by the groſſeſt ignorance that can be in Hiſtory, and which none but *Calvin* could be capable of, he makes Saint *Athanaſius* preſide, who was then but a ſimple Deacon, waiting upon *Alexander* his Patriarch at that Council,

L. 1. *c.* 16.

Athan. *Apol.* 2.

Such was the ignorance of the head of our Proteſtants in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. I do not at all wonder at it; for that was none of his ſtudy. But I am aſtoniſhed to ſee, that men of wit and learning dance to his Pipe, in that they implicitely aſſent to his ignorance in Antiquity, when in the ſyſteme of his hereſie, he rejects matters that are manifeſtly authoriſed by Tradition and Hiſtory, which is the Court of

Record of it; nay, even when he traces it back to the Primitive Ages of the Church, wherein they are forced to confeſs, that it was in its purity.

There are evident proofs of this in the Hiſtory of the Fathers and Councils, where, ſetting aſide ſome frivolous ſuperſtitions of weak people, which we condemn, it may be ſeen, that the ancient Church believed and did, what Catholicks believe and practiſe concerning the Euchariſt, the Sacrifice of the Maſs, the ſeven Sacraments, the Conſiſtency of Grace with Free-will, the Authority of Tradition, the Invocation of Saints, Churches dedicated and conſecrated to God in memory of them, the Veneration of their Relicks and Images, Prayer for the dead, the Faſts of *Lent* and of the *Ember weeks*, the diſtinction of Holy days and working days, that of the Habits of Lay-men and Churchmen, the ſingle life of the Clergy, Vows, Sacred Ceremonies in the adminiſtration and uſe of the Sacraments,

ments, and in publick Worſhip, Divine Worſhip in Greek all over the Eaſt, and in the Latine Tongue in the Weſt, though in moſt Provinces *this* was not underſtood but by the Learned; in a word, concerning all that diſtinguiſhes us from Proteſtants, but eſpecially *Calviniſts.*

This the famous Cardinal *Perron* made out by unqueſtionable teſtimonies, in his Reply to the King of *Great Britain*, where he ſhews, the conformity of the Ancient Catholick Church with ours, in the Eighteenth Chapter of the firſt Book, and throughout the whole Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books of that Learned Work. And to which alſo *David Blondel*, a Man incomparably more able than *Calvin*, eſpecially in the knowledge of Antiquity, thought it not fit to make an Anſwer in that overgrown Volume which he wrote againſt the *Reply*, and wherein he thought it convenient to begin his pretended refutation onely at the Three and twentieth Chapter of the

firſt Book; and to end it with the Four and thirtieth of the ſame Book.

But to paſs by the Proteſtants, againſt whom I pretend not to Diſpute; It is enough to me, that hitherto, without any diſputation, I have proved by Antiquity alone, the Primacy of St. *Peter*, and of the Popes his ſucceſſours in the Chair of *Rome*, and the Prerogatives and Rights which are inſeparable from that Primacy, wherein all Catholicks agree. However, it is very well known, that at preſent, they are not all of the ſame mind, as to certain other Prerogatives, which ſome grant, and others will not allow to him; and eſpecially theſe four, which are, Infallibility, Superiority over a General Council, the Abſolute Power of Governing the Church independantly of the Canons, and the Direct or Indirect Power over *Temporals*. And therefore I muſt now, without deviating from my Principle drawn from Antiquity, make appear, without diſputing

puting and reaſoning, but as a bare Relater of the ſentiments of the Councils and Fathers, nay and of the Popes themſelves, what venerable Antiquity hath always believed concerning theſe points.

CHAP. VI.

The Queſtion ſtated concerning the Infallibility of the Pope.

THE Queſtion here is not to know, whether the Pope, as a private Doctour, and onely giving his opinion and thought of a point of Doctrine, concerning Faith and Manners, may be deceived: for it was never doubted, but that in that quality he ſpeaks onely as another Man, and that by conſequent through the weakneſs and infirmity which is incident to all Men, he is ſubject to Errour, according to the ſaying of the Pſalmiſt, *Omnis homo mendax.*

Nor is it the queſtion, neither to enquire, whether he be infallible when he pronounces from the Chair of the Univerſal Church, jointly, with the Members that are ſubject to him as to their head, whether it be in a General Council where he preſides in perſon, or by his Legats, or with the conſent of the greateſt part

part of Catholick Churches and Biſhops. For as we all allow, that *Jeſus Chriſt* hath given the gift of Infallibility to his Church, and to a Council which repreſents it, for determining Sovereignly, by the Word of God, the differences that might ariſe amongſt Catholicks concerning theſe points of Doctrine: ſo we do confeſs, that when the Pope ſpeaks and decides in that manner, according to which he may ſay, *Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto & nobis*; his words and deciſions are Oracles, and he can in no ways be deceived. As to this there is no diſagreement amongſt Catholicks.

The queſtion then that may be debated, is to know, whether when he ſpeaks from his Chair of *Rome*, as the Maſter and Teacher of all Believers, and having well examined the point in hand, in ſeveral Congregations, his Conſiſtory, or his Synod of his Suffragans, of his Cardinals and Doctours, nay, and having conſulted Univerſities, and by moſt publick and ſolemn Prayers begg'd

the

the assistance of the Holy Ghost; he teaches all Christians, defines, proposes to the whole Church, by a *Bull* or Constitution, what Christians are to believe, whether, I say, when he pronounces in this manner, he be Infallible or not, and whether his Judgment given and declared in that manner, may not be corrected by an Universal Council. And this, methinks, is all that can be said, in clear and formal terms, as to the state of this formal question.

And it is the very same, about which all Catholick Doctours do not agree. For most part of the Doctours on t'other side of the *Alpes*, especially the famous Cardinals *Cajetan*, *Baronius* and *Bellarmine*, and all the Authours who have followed them, will have the Pope in that case, when he declares solemnly to all Believers, by his Constitutions, what they are to believe, as to any controverted point, to be no ways liable to a mistake.

On

On the contrary, an infinite number of the moſt noted Doctours of their time, as *Gerſon*, *Major*, *Almanus*, the Faculty of Theologie of *Paris* ſo often and ſo publickly praiſed by the Popes, and all *France*, as it is even acknowledged by the Doctours *Navarr*, *Victoria* and *John Celaia* Spaniards; *Denis* the *Carthuſian*, *Toſtatus* Biſhop of *Avila* in his Commentaries upon St. *Matthew*, and in the ſecond part of his *Defenſorium*, *Thomas Illyrius* a *Cordelier*, in his *Buckler* againſt *Luther*, which he dedicated to Pope *Adrian* VI. The Cardinals of *Cuſa*, of *Cambray*, and of *Florence*, the Biſhops of *France* in their Aſſembly repreſenting the *Gallican* Church, *Æneas Sylvius* before he was Pope, Pope *Adrian* VI. when he was Profeſſour at *Louvain*, in his *Commentary* upon the *Fourth of the Sentences*, which he cauſed to be reprinted at *Rome* when he was Pope, without any alterations, and a thouſand other moſt Catholick Doctours of the Univerſities of *France*, *Germany*, *Poland*, and of the *Low Countries*,

Countries, who have all very well defended the Primacy of the Pope; all these, I say, maintain, that he is not Infallible, if he do not pronounce in a General Council, or with the consent of the Church.

The diversity of Sentiments amongst Catholicks about that Subject, is then a matter of fact not to be question'd. But what part are we best to take in this dispute, as the most rational and best grounded? that's a question which I ought not to answer, according to the design I have taken, and the method that I have proposed to my self in this *Treatise*. I shall onely then barely relate what hath been believed as to that in Antiquity, and I shall do it without touching at the matter of *Right*, but onely faithfully producing uncontroverted matters of fact, which make appear what the belief of the Ancient Church was concerning that Point.

CHAP. VII.

CHAP. VII.

What Antiquity hath concluded from St. Peter's *being reprehended by St.* Paul.

THAT Action which was of great importance, and which notwithſtanding is not mentioned by St. *Luke* in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, is related by St. *Paul* himſelf, in a very few, but very ſignificant words. *But when Peter*, ſays he, in the ſecond Chapter of his Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, *was come to Antioch, I withſtood him to the face, becauſe he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew, and ſeparated himſelf, fearing them which were of the circumciſion. And the other Jews diſſembled likewiſe with him, inſomuch that Barnabas alſo was carried away with their diſſimulation. But when I ſaw that they walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the* Galat. c. 2.

the Goſpel, I ſaid unto Peter, if thou being a Jew, liveſt after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compelleſt thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews.

It is evident, that St. *Paul* in that place rebukes St. *Peter*, and that ſharply too, and that he not onely relates what he ſaid unto him upon that occaſion, but alſo aſſures us, that St. *Peter* was to be blamed, and conſequently had erred. Now, wherein had he erred according to Saint *Paul*? It was not that he had lived with *Jews* according to the Law of *Moſes*, concerning the diſtinction of meats: for before the Synagogue was honourably interr'd, the legal Ceremonies might ſtill be obſerved; when it was thought convenient, as Saint *Paul* himſelf, oftner than once, obſerved them. But it was, in that he withdrew himſelf from the converted Gentiles, and that living no longer with them, for fear of offending theſe *Jews* that were come from *Jeruſalem*, he gave occaſion to the other *Jews* and converted *Gentiles*, to

Auguſt. *Epiſt. ult. ad* Hieronym.

Act. 16. 18. 21.

to think, that they were ſtill obliged to obſerve the Law of *Moſes*.

The truth is, ſome of theſe new Chriſtians amongſt the *Jews*, who were lately come to *Antioch*, had cauſed a great deal of trouble in that Church, becauſe they maintained, that all who had embraced the Faith of *Jeſus Chriſt*, were obliged to be Circumciſed, if they were not ſo before, and to obſerve the Law of *Moſes*, without which they could not be ſaved. St. *Paul* and St. *Barnabas*, who at that time ſtill Preached the Goſpel at *Antioch*, with all their might withſtood thoſe falſe Apoſtles, and taught the contrary. But when thoſe poor Chriſtians of Gentiliſm ſaw that the Prince of the *Apoſtles*, who had far greater authority than St. *Paul* had, wholly changed his conduct after the arrival of theſe *Jews*; that he ate no more of meats prohibited by the Law; and that thoſe of *Antioch*, who were converted from Judaiſm, and even *Barnabas*, who was before for the liberty of the Goſpel, did the ſame as Saint

Act. 15.

Saint *Peter* did, and ſeparated from them, they thought that they onely did ſo, becauſe it was in reality found that theſe legal obſervations were neceſſary to Salvation, and that they were obliged to keep them as well as the *Jews*.

And that made St. *Paul* tell Saint *Peter*, that he compelled the converted *Gentiles* to Judaiſe, becauſe, by his example, which is a ſtronger and far more perſuaſive argument than words are, he gave them to know, that for all they were Chriſtians, yet they were ſtill obliged to obſerve the Law of *Moſes*, which is contrary to the Goſpel of *Jeſus Chriſt*, whoſe yoke is eaſie, and who by the New Law of Grace hath put us in the perfect liberty of the Sons of God. And therefore Saint *Paul* on that occaſion ſaid, That St. *Peter*, and thoſe who adhered to him in that conduct which made the converted *Gentiles* to err, walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Goſpel.

Take

Take the words of St. *Auſtine* concerning that action of St. *Peter*, in three or four paſſages of his works, where he plainly calls it an errour. St. *Paul*, ſaith he, *was obliged publickly to reprove Saint* Peter, *that he might cure all the reſt by that remedy; for an errour that did hurt to the publick, was not to be rebuked privately. If St.* Paul *ſaid true*, ſays he in another place, *Saint* Peter *walked not Then according to the truth of the Goſpel, and did what he ought not to have done.*

Quod hoc ei curam omnibus dixit, neceſſitas coegit. Non enim erat utile errorem quì palam noceret, in publicis non emendare. Aug. lib. de Expoſ. Epiſt. ad Galat.

Si verum ſcripſit Paulus, verum eſt quod Petrus tunc non ingrediebatur ad veritatem Evangelii, id ergo faciebat quod facere non debebat. Epiſt. 19. ad Hier. *c. 2.*

Petro *dicenti quod fieri non debebat. l. 6. contra Donat. c. 2.*

It maketh nothing to the purpoſe, to ſay, as St. *Jerome* hath done, that all that was but a deſign laid betwixt St *Peter* and St. *Paul*, to bring the *Jews* to their duty, by letting them ſee, that their Protectour St. *Peter* ſubmitted to that reprimand of St. *Paul*. Beſides, that that way of proceeding ſuiteth very ill with the temper of St. *Paul*, and agrees not at all with his words; that diſſimulation no ways juſtifies Saint *Peter*, and makes St. *Paul* an Accomplice in his fault. For it is not

at all lawfull to diſſemble in ſuch a manner, as that the diſſimulation becomes the cauſe of a great ſcandal and ſtumbling-block, which makes people fall into errour, by compelling them to Judaize.

Hieron. Ep. 86. & ſeq. Auguſt. Ep. 8. & ſeq. *Conſilium veritatis adripiſti, & rationi legitimæ, quam Paulus vindicabat, facile conceſſit.* Cypr. ad Quint. Ep. 71.

St. *Auſtine* then who valiantly oppugns that opinion which ſo little favours thoſe two great *Apoſtles*, and who alledges for himſelf St. *Ambroſe* and St. *Cyprian*, is ſo perſuaded that St. *Peter* on that occaſion erred, that he makes uſe of that Inſtance to excuſe the errour of St. *Cyprian* concerning the Baptiſm of Hereticks, which he reckoned to be invalid. *If St.* Peter, ſaith he, *could compell the Gentiles to Judaize, contrary to the rule of truth which the Church hath ſince followed, Why might not St.* Cyprian *compell Hereticks and Schiſmaticks to be Re-baptized, contrary to the rule of truth, which the whole Church hath obſerved ſince?* And elſewhere he makes uſe of the ſame inſtance, to condemn that errour

Si potuit Petrus *contra veritatis regulam quam poſtea Eccleſia tenuit, cogere Gentes Judaizare: cur non potuit* Cyprianus, *contra veritatis regulam quam poſtea tota Eccleſia tenuit, cogere hæreticos & ſchiſmaticos Re-baptizari.* Aug. l. 2. de Bapt. contra Donatiſt. c. 1.

rour of St. *Cyprian: I admit not*, ſays he, *that Doctrine of* Cyprian, *though I be incomparably inferiour to that great Man; as though I be incomparably leſs than St.* Peter, *yet I admit not, neither doe what he did, in compelling the* Gentiles *to Judaize.*

Hoc Cypriani *non accipio, quamvis incomparabiliter inferior* Cypriano, *ſicut illud Apoſtoli* Petri, *quod Gentes Judaizare cogebat, nec accipio, nec facio, quamvis inferior incomparabiliter* Petro. *l.* 2. *contra* Crꝛſcon. *c.* 32.

An infinite number of great Men have in that followed St. *Auguſtine*, as the Maſter and chief of the Doctours: but at preſent I ſhall onely produce one, whoſe authority far ſurpaſſes that of all the reſt. And that is Pope *Pelagius* II. who, following the example of St. *Auſtine*, in relation to St. *Cyprian*, acknowledges, and, at the ſame time, excuſes the errour of Pope *Vigilius*, by that of St. *Peter*. It is a very remarkable matter of fact. Take it thus.

After that wicked *Neſtorius* had been condemned in the Council of *Epheſus*, ſome of his party publiſhed certain Writings of *Theodore* of *Mopſueſtia*, wherein, under other terms than thoſe

Liberat. *in Breviar. c.* 10.

which that *Hereſiarch* had uſed, he ſaid almoſt the ſame thing, making it apparent enough, that by the two natures which he admitted to be in *Jeſus Chriſt*, he underſtood two diſtinct Perſons. But ſeeing that errour was not expreſſed in ſuch formal termes, that all men might diſcover it, and that beſides, this ſame *Theodore* had, in his life-time, been held in great veneration: that, as it commonly happens, occaſioned great debates; ſome, as *John* Patriarch of *Antioch*, ſaying that there was nothing to be found fault with in his Book: Others, who were headed by *Rabula* Biſhop of *Edeſſa*, maintaining, that it contained pure *Neſtorianiſm* a little diſguiſed.

This diſpute growing hotter after the death of *Rabula*, *Ibas*, who ſucceeded him in the Biſhoprick of *Edeſſa*, taking a courſe quite contrary to his Predeceſſour, wrote a long Letter to *Maris Perſan* a *Neſtorian* Heretick, wherein he thought it not

not enough to give great praiſes to *Theodore*, but inveighs alſo ſharply againſt St. *Cyrill* of *Alexandria*, the ſcourge of *Neſtorianiſm*, though at the ſame time he condemns the Doctrine of *Neſtorius*; whether he ſpake ſincerely, or that he would thereby caution himſelf againſt the proceſs that might have been brought againſt him, for that he had ſo openly declared for *Theodore*.

The truth is, ſometime after he was accuſed in the famous Council of *Chalcedon*, where that Letter was produc'd againſt him, and read in full Council. But ſeeing there was nothing to be found in it but praiſes of *Theodore*, whoſe Book had not been examined, and invectives againſt the perſon and conduct of St. *Cyrill*; and beſides, that *Ibas* in that Council pronounced Anathema againſt *Neſtorius*, and condemned his Doctrine, more ſeverely than he had even done in his Letter: He was Abſolved, as well as *Theodoret*, who did the ſame, though he had

Ann. 451. *Concil.* Chalced. *Act.* 16.

Written againſt St. *Cyrill*, more bitterly than *Ibas* had done. But the Council took no notice of that *Treatiſe*.

Nevertheleſs, ſeeing theſe three Writings, which are very well known by the famous name of the *Three Chapters*, ſo much talked of, favoured *Neſtorianiſm*, and that that Hereſie is directly oppoſite to that of *Eutyches*, which admits indeed but one perſon, but alſo, but one nature in *Jeſus Chriſt*. The Emperour *Juſtinian* was eaſily perſuaded, that if theſe *Three Chapters* were condemned, the Catholicks might be reconciled with the *Acephali*, who were a remnant of *Eutychians*. This Prince, who at that time deſired nothing more than the Peace of the Church, zealouſly undertook that affair. He made an Edict againſt theſe *Three Chapters*, which was ſigned by *Mennas* and the other Patriarchs of the Eaſt; and to render that condemnation ſtill more authentick, ſeeing he was at that time Maſter of *Italy*, having

Ann. 546.

Petav. 1. *p. Ratiocin. l.* 7. *c.* 7.

having driven the *Goths* out of it, he made Pope *Vigilius* come to *Conſtantinople*, that he might oblige him to ſign it as the other Patriarchs of the Eaſt had done.

There is nothing in Hiſtory more extraordinary, than the fortune of that Pope. His ambition at firſt made him Anti-Pope, having got himſelf to be choſen by the intereſt of the Empreſs *Theodora*, who put him in the place of *Sylverius* the lawfull Pope; that ſhe cauſed to be depoſed and baniſhed, and to whom that Intruder promiſed to condemn the *Three Chapters*, and to approve the faith of *Anthimius*, as he did. And therefore *Sylverius*, for all he was baniſhed, Excommunicated him as an Anti-pope. This holy Prelate dying ſhortly after that Condemnation, the Clergy of *Rome*, for avoiding a Schiſm, elected of new *Vigilius* Canonically, who by that means became true Pope; and then changing his conduct, that he might overturn all that he had done in favour

Liber. c. 22.

Victor. Tunon. *in Chron.*

Sylver. *Epiſt.* &c.

of *Theodora*: he condemned *Anthimus* as an *Eutychian*, and recalled the Condemnation of the *Three Chapters*, which indeed were contrary to the *Eutychians*, but also bordering upon the other extreme, mightily favoured the *Nestorians*.

Greg. *l.* 2. *c.* 36. Paul. *diacon. l.* 17.

In this condition was he then when the Emperour called him to *Constantinople* to approve the Condemnation of the *Three Chapters*. He had much adoe to resolve upon it, because he thought, as many *Occidentals* did, that that was to impeach the Council of *Chalcedon*, which had received *Ibas* and *Theodoret*, the defenders of *Theodore* of *Mopsuestia*. But it was represented to him, that the Council had not received them untill they had condemned the *Nestorians*, and that it had not examined neither the Book of *Theodore*, nor that of *Theodoret*; and that, seeing now they were sufficiently convinced and persuaded, that the Doctrine of *Nestorius*, condemned in the Coun-

Forundus Hermianen.

cil

cil of *Epheſus*, was contained in theſe Writings, he ought to condemn them, thereby to take all advantage from the *Neſtorians*.

Vigilius, at length, acquieſced to theſe Remonſtrances, and the year following made his *Decree*, whereby he condemns the *Three Chapters*, but with this reſerve, *Saving the reſpect and ſubmiſſion which is due to the Council of* Chalcedon. *Juſtinian* not ſatisfied with that, would have the Pope, ſeeing the queſtion concerned not that Council, which had not examined theſe Books, to condemn them abſolutely, and without that modification, leſt the *Neſtorians* might make uſe of it for eluding a like condemnation. But *Vigilius*, who was always loth to offend that Council, would not condeſcend to it, how badly ſoever they treated him to oblige him to doe ſo. *Ann.* 547. *Judicatum.*

In fine, after many debates about the ſubject, *Juſtinian*, who reſolved to

to put an end to that affair, for restoring peace to the Church, caused the Fifth Council to be held at *Constantinople* in spight of *Vigilius*, who was so far from granting the Emperour what he desired, that he made a new Constitution, wherein he again takes upon him the protection of the *Three Chapters*, and forbids to condemn them. But notwithstanding all his efforts, that Council, where he would not assist, absolutely condemned them; and because *Vigilius* would not consent to that condemnation, he was banished by *Justinian*, who some time after gave him his liberty, and sent him home to his See, because once more changing his conduct and opinions, he condemned in Writing the *Three Chapters*, according to the Decree of the Council; and that was the fourth and last time that he had changed; for as he was upon his return to *Rome*, he died in *Sicily* the year following.

Ann. 553. *V. Syn.* 5. *Tom.* 3. *Concil. Constitutum.*

Evagr. l. 4. *c.* 37. *Phot. de septem Synodis.*

Appen. Marcell.

However, this last change did not cure the Schism that was formed

med in the Church about that point. For though the Succeſſours of this Pope had admitted the Decrees of that Council, which holds the fifth place amongſt the Ecumenical Councils, yet many Biſhops, and amongſt others, thoſe of *Africa* and *Iſtria*, taking no notice in the leaſt of that laſt change of *Vigilius*, ſtuck obſtinately to his former conſtitution, whereby he had publickly declared for the *Three Chapters*, forbidding all Believers to condemn them; and though *Pelagius* II. who held the Holy See Two or three and twenty years after *Vigilius*, did all he could to perſuade and bring them to their duty, and to undeceive them of their errour, he could never ſucceed in it.

Greg. *Pap.* 1. *Ep.* 24. *& alib. ſæpe.*

Vict. Tun. Farund. Herm.

For they always alledged, that the *Roman* Church had formerly

Pelag. 11. *Ep.* 7. *quæ eſt tertia ad Epiſc. Iſtriæ. Dicentes quod in cauſæ princi-*

pio, & ſedes Apoſtolica per Vigilium Papam, & omnes Latinarum Provinciarum principes, damnationi trium capitulorum fortiter reſtiterunt. ibid. *Errorem tarde cognoverunt & tanto eis celerius credi debuit, quanto serum conſtantiæ, quouſque verum cognoſcerent à certamine non quieuit.* ibid.

Taught

Taught them the contrary of what they would have them at preſent confeſs; and that the Holy See, by Pope *Vigilius* and the other Biſhops of the Weſt, when that cauſe began to be debated, had vigorouſly oppoſed the condemnation of theſe *Three Chapters*. Whereupon that wiſe Pope told them, ingenuouſly and convincingly, That for that very reaſon they ought to condemn them, becauſe that vigorous reſiſtance was an evident ſign, that the *Romans*, and other Occidentals yielded not, till at length they came to the knowledge of the truth, which they had not known before, and clearly ſaw that they had been miſtaken, in approving and maintaining Writings which ought to be condemned; and he adds, that it is a very laudable change, to turn from errour to truth.

He moreover confirms that Argument by the examples of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*. *St.* Paul, ſaid he, *long reſiſted the truth of the Goſpel, and was*

Quia diu veritati reſtitit, unde ad confirmanda corda credentium, in ejuſdem prædicatione veritatis adjutorium ſumpſit.

was the moſt zealous aſſerter of Judaiſme againſt the Chriſtians, whom he perſecuted. By that he proves to the Jews *and* Gentiles, *that they ought to embrace Chriſtianity, becauſe after ſo great reſiſtance he would not have yielded to* Jeſus Chriſt, *if he had not clearly known the truth, and that he had been in an errour before. St.* Peter, continues he, *held long for the neceſſity of the legal obſervations, compelling the* Gentiles *to Judaize. He yielded afterward to reaſon and truth by the reproof that St.* Paul *gave him, telling him, that he walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Goſpel. After that, changing his conduct, he powerfully withſtood thoſe, who, in the Council of* Jeruſalem, *would have ſubjected Chriſtians to the yoke of the Ancient Law.*

Would they have had reaſon then to have ſaid to him, when they ſaw him Teach the quite contrary to what he had Preached before, We will not hear what you tell us at preſent, becauſe you formerly Preached to us quite another thing? Not at all, becauſe theſe two

Diu quidem reſtitit, ne ad fidem Gentes ſine Circumciſione, &c. diu ſe à converſatione Gentium communione ſubtraxit, &c.

Ab eodem Paulo *poſtmodum ratione ſuſcepta cum vidiſſet quoſdam, &c. dixit: cur tentatis Deum imponentes jugum, &c.*

Hæc quæ dicis audire non poſſumus, quia aliud ante prædicaſti.

two Apoſtles *having long reſiſted the truth of the Goſpel, each in his way, and at length followed that truth, changed from evil to good.* So, goes on that Pope, making a right application of theſe two inſtances, to the point of the *Three Chapters*, *The Holy See ought not to be upbraided with a change, ſince after it hath found out the truth which it ſearched into, it now condemns the Three Chapters, which it approved before it found the truth.*

Si igitur in trium capitulorum negotio, aliud cum veritas quæreretur, aliud autem inventâ veritate dictum eſt; cur mutatio ſententiæ hujus ſedi in crimen objicitur, &c.

It is, in my Judgment, very clear, that Pope *Pelagius* in that place ſays plainly, and without biaſs, that as St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* had erred before their change, to which they ought to adhere, ſo *Vigilius* was miſtaken in his conſtitution, whereby he obliges Believers to maintain the Doctrine of the *Three Chapters*, and that they muſt imitate the Holy See in its change, when having approved them with *Vigilius*, it condemns them, after he had diſcovered the truth which he knew not before. Theſe are the words of *Pelagius* II.

Quid obſtat, ſi ignorantiam ſuam defotens verba permutet?

I

I know very well, that Cardinal *Baronius* ſays, and labours to prove in his *Annals*, that St. *Peter*, upon that occaſion, erred not at all, and committed not the leaſt fault. I ſhall not undertake to refute and overthrow his Arguments, as ſome think they have done with very little difficulty. I diſpute not at all in this *Treatiſe*, where I am onely to relate matters of Fact. It is enough then that I ſay; It's true that that great Cardinal is of that Judgment, becauſe he believed Saint *Peter* to be infallible; In the mean time St. *Auſtine*, ſo far from believing it, thought he erred five times, when he was in fear of being drowned, and our Saviour told him, *O thou of little faith wherefore didſt thou doubt?* when he would have diverted him from ſuffering for us, and was rebuked by theſe piercing words, *Get thee behind me Satan*; When he cut off *Malchus* his Ear, and three times denied his Maſter; and laſt of all, when he fell into that failing for which St. *Paul* reproved him.

Baron. *ad Ann.* 51. n. 39.

Et cum in mari titubaſſet, & cum dominum carnaliter à paſſione revocaſſet, & cum aurem ſervi gladio præcidiſſet & cum ipſum dominum ter negaſſet, & cum in ſimulationem poſtea ſuperſtitioſam lapſus eſſet. Auguſt. *de agone Chriſtiano. c.* 30.

him. St. *Auſtine* then, St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Cyprian*, Pope *Pelagius*, and even St. *Paul*, ſpeak poſitively to the contrary of what *Baronius* ſays, as I have juſt now demonſtrated.

This has made learned men argue from St. *Auſtine*, who they think cannot be anſwered: Either Saint *Paul* ſpoke truth, when he ſaid St. *Peter* was to be blamed, that he walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Goſpel, and compelled the converted *Gentiles* to Judaize; or what he ſaid was falſe. If he ſpoke truth, it is then true, that St. *Peter* was not Infallible, ſince he actually erred in that particular. If he did not ſpeak truth, it muſt then be concluded, that the *Epiſtle to the Galatians*, which makes a part of H. Scripture, is not the Word of God; which is a manifeſt errour in matter of Faith.

Again, when St. *Paul* ſpake in that manner, either he thought as he ſpoke, or did not. If he believed what he ſaid to be true, it was his opinion then, that St. *Peter* was not Infallible. If he believed it not, then muſt he

he in the ſame Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, wherein he proteſts before God that he lied not, have told a lie; which is not to be ſaid without Blaſphemy, ſince what he writes in that Epiſtle is the Word of God who cannot lie. And thus it is made out, that according to St. *Paul*, thoſe great Saints, and that wiſe Pope, who underſtood himſelf very well, St. *Peter* was guilty of a notable miſtake at that time, when he inſinuated to the Jews and Gentiles that they were obliged to keep the Law of *Moſes*: which the Church immediately after condemned in the Council of the Apoſtles held at *Jeruſalem*.

For it is to be obſerved, which a great many have not minded, that, as that Pope whoſe words I have cited, does expreſly ſay, it was before that Council of the Apoſtles that St. *Peter* did that action which rendred him blame-worthy. And who does not ſee that he had been incomparably more worthy of blame and reproof, if, as Cardinal *Baro-*

nius will have it, he had done it immediately after the Decree of the Council, which had juſt then defined, he himſelf having ſubſcribed to the Decree, that Chriſtians were no more obliged to obſerve thoſe legal Rites, excepting in one ſmall point, and that for a certain time; and that after he had ſpoken ſo well on that ſubject, to free Chriſtians from that Yoke, he ſhould have again endeavoured to ſubject them to it, by obliging them to Judaize? That would have been ſo ſtrange a thing, and ſo unbeſeeming an Apoſtle, and the Prince of Apoſtles, that I make no doubt but that for the honour that is due to him, it is far better to follow in that the judgment of that ancient Pope, than the Opinion of this Cardinal who lived but in the laſt age. It follows then from theſe matters of Fact which I have now moſt faithfully related, that a great Pope, and thoſe Holy Fathers, the moſt venerable and learned of Antiquity, have not believed,

ved, even according to St. *Paul*, that St. *Peter* was infallible, nor by conſequent that the Popes who have no greater privilege and prerogative than St. *Peter* had, have received that gift of Infallibility.

As to the objections that are drawn from the words of *Jeſus Chriſt* ſpoken to St. *Peter*, *Upon that Rock will I build my Church*; *I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*; *I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not*; *feed my ſheep*: It is eaſie to anſwer them by ſaying that, according to the common interpretation of the Fathers, and eſpecially of St. *Auſtine*, they were ſpoken to St. *Peter* as repreſenting the Church by the union of its Paſtours with him as with their *Head*, and who, by virtue of that union, make with him but one univerſal Epiſcopacy. And the better to expreſs that unity, he applies himſelf and ſpeaks to one onely, that is, to the head, to whom he gave the Primacy over the reſt. So that when in that union, or rather that

Inter omnes Apoſtolos hujus Eccleſiæ Catholicæ perſonam ſuſtinet Petrus: huic enim Eccleſiæ claves regni cœlorum datæ ſunt, & cum ei dicitur, ad omnes dicitur, amas me, paſce oves meas. Auguſt. *de Agon. Chriſt. lib.* 30. *Ita* Ambroſe *l. de dign. Sacerd. c.* 2. Chryſ. *hom.* 79. *in* Matth. 24. Cypr. *de unit. Eccleſ.* Hier. *contra* Jovin. *lib.* 1.

Ut Petrus, quando ei dictum eſt, tibi dabo claves, in figura perſonam geſtabat Eccleſiæ: & quando dictum eſt, paſce oves meas, Eccleſia quoque perſonam in figura geſtabat. Auguſt. *in* Pſal. 108. *Tract.* 1. 118. 129. *in* Joan. *Ser. de* 4. *quaſt. apud poſſ. c.* 5. & 6. *Serm.* 13. *ſup.* Matth. *c.* 2.

unity, he pronounces and defines jointly with them in a Council, or with consent of the Church by her Biſhops; he cannot err, the foundation ſtands always ſure, and the ſheep are always well governed and well fed.

But becauſe Cardinal *Bellarmine*, and thoſe who follow him, will have theſe words, *I have prayed for thee*, Peter, *that thy faith fail not*, to be applied abſolutely to the Perſon of St. *Peter*, and without relation to the Church which he repreſents by virtue of his Primacy, we muſt grant them what they pretend. For, the truth is, they may be underſtood alſo in that ſenſe: but then they have a very natural and literal meaning, which is that of almoſt all the ancient Fathers and Interpreters of Holy Scripture, who ſay that in this place our Saviour onely ſpake of the time of his Paſſion, when the Apoſtles were to be terribly tempted, as he himſelf foretold them. Then addreſſing himſelf to St. *Peter*, told him that he had prayed

prayed for him, not that he might not commit any ſin of Infidelity, for he committed a fearfull one againſt the confeſſion of Faith, by denying his Maſter thrice: but that being recovered from his fall, he might not loſe the Faith for ever, that by the example of his Repentance, he might confirm therein his Brethren, who were much ſtartled and ſhaken; and that afterwards he might perſevere unto the end.

This is the common interpretation of the Holy Fathers, and particularly of St. *Chryſoſtome*, and Saint *Auſtine*, who often make uſe of that paſſage to prove the neceſſity of praying, and of obtaining grace from God, without which we cannot perſevere. And this is alſo the ſenſe that *Theophylact*, *Oecumenius*, *Euthymius*, Cardinal *Hugo*, *Albertus Magnus*, St. *Thomas*, St. *Bonaventure*, *Lyranus*, *Dionyſius Carthuſianus*,

Non dixit, non negabis; ſed ut non deficiat fides tua, curâ enim illius factum eſt ne omnino Petri fides evaneſceret. Ne deficiat fides tua, hoc eſt ne in fine pereas, & humanam arguens naturam, cum ex ſe nihil ſit. Chryſ. *hom.* 63.

Quid enim rogavit, niſi perſeverantiam uſque in finem: Aug. *de Cor. & Ge. c.* 6.

Ut non periret finaliter. Hug. *in* c. 22. Luc.

Non ut Petrus non caderet, ſed ut non deficeret, quia quamvis reciderit, reſurrexerit. Bonav. *in* Luc.

Ne penitus extirpetur, aut finaliter deficiat. Dion. Carth. *in* Luc.

Ut non finaliter deficiat fides tua.

Albert. Mag. *in hunc locum.*

and all the reſt of the moſt famous Interpreters and Divines, have followed as being the true literal ſenſe. It is evident that that onely agrees with the time of the Paſſion, and the Perſon of St. *Peter* alone, wherein his Succeſſours can have no part. And though they ſhould pretend they had, yet that would not hinder but that they might fail and fall as St. *Peter* did, by publiſhing a falſhood contrary to the true faith; which is more againſt the duty of a Pope, than to believe an Errour without publiſhing it.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

What follows Naturally from the great debate that Pope Victor *had with the Biſhops of* Aſia.

THere had been for a long time very different Cuſtoms in the Church about the Celebration of the Feſtival of *Eaſter*, and the obſervation of the Faſt which ought to go before that holy day. For all over the Weſt, according to the practice obſerved from the beginning in the Church of *Rome*, that Feſtival was kept on *Sunday*, which is the day of our Saviour's Reſurrection. But the Churches of *Aſia* founded by the Apoſtle St. *John*, ſome of their Neighbours, and many other Churches of the Eaſt, kept it always the fourteenth of the Moon of *March*, as the Paſſover is appointed to be kept in *Exodus*, and according to the Tradition which they had received from St. *John*.

Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccl.* l. 5. c. 24. Hieron. *de ſcript.* c. 44. Exod. 12. Hieron. *de ſcript.* in Polychr.

As to the Faſt that is to be obſerved before *Eaſter*, there was ſtill a greater diverſity in the Cuſtoms eſtabliſhed in ſeveral places. For ſome faſted but one day before that Feaſt, as we do on the Vigile of *Chriſtmas* and of *Whitſunday*; others faſted two days; ſome who were numerous faſted longer, and many obſerved punctually the Fourty days faſt of *Lent*. However theſe different cuſtoms that were amongſt Chriſtians of the ſecond, nay and of the firſt age of the Church, concerning *Lent* and *Eaſter*, made no breach at all of the peace, and every one obſerved peaceably the cuſtom of their Church, which they thought to be good, without condemning the practices of others.

Irenæ. *ap.* Euſeb. *hiſt. l.* 5. *c.* 24.

Omnes Eccleſiæ tum eorum qui decimo quarto die diem feſtum pachatis obſervabant, tum eorum qui ſecus, tranquillâ pace inter ipſas fruebantur.
Euſeb. *Ibid.*

This is ſo true, that St. *Polycarp* Biſhop of *Smirna* being come to *Rome*, under the Pontificat of Saint *Anicetus*, theſe two great Saints, in a long conference which they had about the celebration of the Feaſt of *Eaſter*, did what they could mutually, to draw one another over to their

their party; and ſeeing both remained ſtedfaſt in their opinions, St. *Polycarp*, ſaying always, that he had from St. *John* his Maſter the cuſtom that was obſerved in his Church, and St. *Anicetus* affirming, that that which was followed at *Rome*, and in the Weſtern Churches, was derived from St. *Peter*, they could never agree upon the matter. Yet that hindred not but that they ſtill lived together in great amity, and in the ſame communion, inſomuch that the Pope, to doe honour to St. *Polycarp*, prayed him to officiate publickly in his Church. *Ibid.*

That good intelligence continued always betwixt the Popes and *Aſiatick* Biſhops, untill *Victor* I. who having held ſeveral Councils at *Rome* about that ſubject, amongſt the *Gauls* and elſewhere, where the practice of the *Roman* Church was obſerved, would needs compell the *Aſiaticks* to conform to it, by celebrating *Eaſter* on Sunday. And becauſe theſe who thought not themſelves obliged to obey him contrary to *Ann.* 193. Euſeb. *l.* 5. *c.* 22. Euſeb. *c.* 24.

to the tradition which their Churches had from St. *John*, would by no means comply: He threatened them with Excommunication, and publiſhed againſt them that which now adays is called a *Monitory*.

Omnes fratres eam incolentes regionem prorſus à communione ſecludendos edicit. Ibid.

Polycrates, who was at that time Biſhop of *Epheſus*, held alſo a Council with his brethren about the ſame ſubject, and anſwering in name of all by a Synodal Letter, to Pope *Victor*, and his Biſhops, he ſays, That what the *Aſiaticks* did, had been religiouſly obſerved by the *Apoſtles* St. *Philip* and St. *John*, by another St. *John* a Biſhop and Martyr, whoſe body reſted at *Epheſus*, by St. *Polycarp* Biſhop of *Smirna*, by the Martyr St. *Thraſeas*, and by many other holy Biſhops, who had always celebrated that Holy-day the fourteenth of the Moon, according to that Tradition; that for himſelf, who was ſixty five years of age, having conſulted many able Men of all Nations, and carefully read all Writings for informing himſelf in that con-

Hieron. *de* Script. *in* Polychr.

Peragratâ omni ſcripturâ non formidabo eos qui nobis minantur. &c.

troverted

troverted point, he did not fear thoſe that threatned him, becauſe it hath been ſaid by his Predeceſſours, that it is better to obey God than Man.

And ſeeing *Victor* ſtill perſiſted in his threats, and that he would by all means Excommunicate the *Aſiaticks* if they obeyed not: ſeveral Biſhops of other Countries, who blamed his proceeding, wrote ſharply to him, to divert him from his enterpriſe. Amongſt others St. *Irenæus* the great Archbiſhop of *Lyons* ſent him a long Letter in name of all the *Gallican* Church, whom he had aſſembled for that effect, wherein he repreſents to him, with as much force at leaſt, but with far greater moderation than the reſt, that he ought not, for a difference of that nature, cut off from the Univerſal Church ſo many particular Churches, ſo many Biſhops, and ſo many Believers, who acted according to an ancient Tradition, upon which they founded themſelves. He adds, that he would doe far better to follow the example of ſo many holy Popes his Predeceſſours, *Anicetus*,

Verum iſta cæteris omnibus parum placebant Epiſcopis ..... quorum verba utpote Victorem acrius & acerbius conſuentium, ſcriptis prodita adhuc extant.
Euſeb. *l.* 5. *c.* 24. *Ibid.*

Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus and *Sixtus*, who, though they, as well as he, had observed a quite different custome from that of the Bishops of *Asia*, yet never treated them as Hereticks for that, nor forbore to communicate with them in a perfect union.

Multos Asiæ & eorum in Episcopos..... damnandos credidérat. Hieron. *de script. Eccles. c.* 24.

But notwithstanding all these Remonstrances, *Victor* was still of the mind that they ought to be Condemned. Nay, there are some who affirm, that he did actually condemn and thunder an Anathema against them. However it be, it is certain that they would not submit to his Ordinances, that the custome of their Churches, concerning the Feast of *Easter* was allowed them, and that they who observed it were not reputed Hereticks, cut off from the communion of Catholicks. It was about an hundred and eight years after that the great Council of *Nice* abolished that custome, in respect that Saint *John* had onely allowed it for a time, in these Provinces of *Asia* that bordered upon the *Jews*, to give an honoura-

Victori non dederunt manus. Hieron. *Ibid.*

honourable Funeral to the *Synagogue*, and that the other practice was taken univerſally as tranſmitted from the *Apoſtles*; after which, there lay an obligation upon Chriſtians to ſubmit to that Decree, and they who headſtrongly refuſed to obey it, were declared Heretieks under the name of *Quartodecumans*.

This being ſo, it is evident to all Men, that neither theſe Biſhops of *Aſia* and of the Eaſt, nor St. *Irenæus* and the *Gallican* Church, nor the Biſhops of other Countries, who wrote ſo ſmartly to Pope *Victor* in favour of theſe Eaſtern Churches, did believe the Pope to be Infallible. For had they believed it, it is certain on the one hand, that theſe *Aſiaticks* would have ſubmitted to the Decree of the Pope, as they afterwards ſubmitted to that of a Council, becauſe they believed, as all other Catholicks doe, that a Council is Infallible; and on the other hand, it is very clear, that St. *Irenæus*, and ſo many other Biſhops would not have written, as they did to Pope *Victor*, and found fault

fault with his conduct: For they never queſtioned but that thoſe who refuſed to obey an Infallible Tribunal, ought to be condemned and puniſhed. It was not then believed in the Church, that the Pope had the gift of Infallibility, though he might make a Decree for the inſtruction of all believers.

CHAP. IX.

CHAP. IX.

What inference is to be made from that famous conteſt that happened betwixt the Pope, St. Stephen, *and St.* Cyprian, *concerning the Baptiſm of Hereticks.*

THis famous queſtion that hath made ſo much noiſe in the Church, was fourty years before St. *Cyprian*, ſolemnly examined in a Council held in *Africa* by *Agrippinus* Biſhop of *Carthage*; and there it was determined, that the Baptiſm of Hereticks being null, there was a neceſſity of Re-baptizing all thoſe, who, having abjured their Hereſie, ſhould return to the boſome of the Church. *Vincentius Lirinenſis* hath Written, that that ſame *Agrippinus* was the firſt, who, contrary to the cuſtome of the Univerſal Church, and the determination of his Brethren, thought that Hereticks ought to be Re-baptiſed. But ſaving the honour and reſpect that is due to ſo great a Man,

Ann. 217.

Cypr. *Epiſt.* 71. *ad* Quin. *& Epiſt. ad* Jubaian.

Commonit. 6. 9.

Man, it is evident he was miſtaken. For beſides that the Biſhops of *Africa* and *Numidia*, with common conſent, and in conjunction with *Agrippinus*, decided the ſame thing: *Tertullian*, who Wrote his excellent Book of *Preſcriptions againſt Hereticks*, fourteen years before the Council of *Agrippinus*, ſays therein very plainly, that their Baptiſm is not valid: Which in his Book of *Baptiſm* he alſo aſſerts in moſt expreſs terms; a Book Written by him before he fell into the Hereſie of the *Montaniſts*. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who flouriſhed in the ſame time, alſo rejects the Baptiſm of Hereticks: which ſhews, that it was the doctrine and cuſtome of the Church of *Alexandria*, the chief and moſt illuſtrious Church, next to that of *Rome*. So that *Agrippinus*, and the Biſhops of *Africa* and *Numidia*, whom he aſſembled in a Council to determine that Queſtion, are not the firſt who eſtabliſhed that Cuſtome and Diſcipline, which appoints all Hereticks, who

Cypr. *loc. citat.*

Ann. 203. *Cap.* 12.

Cap. 15.

Ann. 200. *Strommat.* 1.

who return into the boſome of the Church to be Re-baptized.

Probably it may be objected by ſome, that what theſe ancient Authours ſay, ought onely to be underſtood of the Hereticks of their times, who, all of them, blaſpheming againſt the moſt Holy Trinity, Baptized not in the Name of the *Father, Son* and *Holy Ghoſt*, and that therefore their Baptiſm was null; which is moſt true. But the reaſon whereupon they ground the nullity of the Baptiſm of Hereticks, to wit, that they are ſtrangers, without the Pale of the Church, and that we are forbidden to have any commerce with them, proves manifeſtly, that what they ſaid ought to be underſtood of all ſorts of Hereticks, both preſent and to come, becauſe they are all out of the Pale of the Church.

Ad quos vetamur accedere, quis ſervus cibaria ab extraneo, ne dicam ab inimico domini ſui petat? &c. Tertull. *de præſcrip.*

Quos extraneos utiq; teſtatur ipſa adémptio communicationis. Id. *de* Baptiſ.

Trajicies aquam alienam? &c. Clem. Alex.

Now ſeeing ſome conſiderable time after the Council of *Agrippinus, Novatian*, who was the firſt Anti-pope, cauſed Catholicks who followed the party of the true Pope

Cornelius to be Re-baptized, the Queſtion concerning the Baptiſm of Hereticks was argued afreſh in *Africa*, where it was put, Whether or not the *Novatian* Schiſmaticks, who returned to the Church, ought to be Re-baptized. Whereupon St. *Cyprian* having aſſembled a Provincial Council at *Carthage*, it was there declared, that ſince no body can be lawfully Baptized out of the Church, there was a neceſſity of Re-baptizing Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, thoſe excepted, who, having been Baptized in the Catholick Church, had afterward ſeparated from it; becauſe Baptiſm, once rightly adminiſtred, could never again be reiterated.

Litt. *Synod. ad Epiſc. humid. ap* Cypr. *Epiſt.* 90. *Numid. ap* Cypr. *Epiſt.* 70.

Cypr. *Epiſt.* 74. *ad* Pomp.

The Biſhops of *Numidia* who had received the Decree of the Council of *Agrippinus*, having conſulted Saint *Cyprian* upon that new emergent, received alſo the Decree of the Council of *Carthage*; and that it might be rendered more Authentick, Saint *Cyprian* aſſembled them together, with the Biſhops of his Province, in

Litt. *Synod. ad Epiſc. Numid.*

2

a ſecond Synod, where the deciſion of the former was confirmed. And thereupon a Synodal Letter was written to the Pope St. *Stephen*, informing him of what had been decided in thoſe two Councils, to wit, that all thoſe, who being out of the Church, had been polluted by the profane Baptiſm of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, ought to be Re-baptiſed: which was alſo confirmed in a third Council, wherein were preſent the Biſhops of *Mauritania*, with thoſe of *Africa* and *Numidia*.

Cypr. *Epiſt.* 73. *ad* Jubai.

Eos qui ſunt foris extra Eccleſiam tinctí, & apud hæreticos & ſchiſmaticos profanæ aquæ labe maculati, quando ab nos venerint Baptiſare oportere, & quod parum ſit eis manum imponere. Epiſt. 70.

Pope *Stephen*, though his Predeceſſours had not oppoſed the Council of *Agrippinus*, but left the *Africans* in the poſſeſſion of their cuſtome, thought that he ought to condemn it as contrary to Apoſtolical Tradition. And thereupon, in two Letters which he Wrote to the *Africans*, he made a Decree quite contrary to that of St. *Cyprian*, and of thoſe three Councils. Theſe are the proper terms of the Decree of the Pope, which we have in the

Apud Cypr. & ap. Auguſt. *l.* 6. & 7. *de Bapt.*

Euſeb. *Hiſt. l.* 6. *c.* 5.

Epiſtles of St. *Cyprian*, for the Letters of St. *Stephen* have not come to our hands. *If any one return to us from what Hereſie ſoever it be, let nothing be innovated, and let nothing be done but what Tradition authoriſes; that is to ſay, that hands be onely laid upon him, to reconcile him by repentance.*

Si quis à quâcunque Hæreſi venerit ad nos nihil innovetur, niſi quod traditum eſt, ut manus ei imponatur ad pœnitentiam. Ap. Cyprian. *Epiſt.* 79. *ad* Pompeian.

There is nothing more oppoſite than thoſe two Decrees, if you take them literally. That of Saint *Cyprian* will have all Hereticks to be Re-baptized, from what Hereſie ſoever they return, and all that are out of the Church; and that it is not enough to lay hands upon them; but the Pope by his, declares, that it is ſufficient, and forbids any Heretick to be Re-baptiſed. This St. *Auſtine* confirms, when he expreſly aſſures us, that *Stephen* would have no Heretick to be Re-baptized, and that he was extreamly offended againſt all thoſe that did it.

Qui ex quâcunque hæreſi ad Eccleſiam convertuntur, unico & legitimo Baptiſmate Baptizentur. Cypr. *Epiſt. ad* Jubaian.

Eo quod parum ſit eis manum imponere. Stephanus *Baptiſmum* Chriſti *in nullo iterandum eſſe cenſebat, & hoc facientibus graviter ſuccenſebat.* Auguſt. *l. de unic. Baptiſ. c.* 14.

The

The truth is, *Euſebius* in his Hiſtory remarks, that the true ſtate of that great Queſtion, that was then in agitation, was to know, Whether thoſe who returned from any Hereſie whatſoever, ought to be Re-baptized.

Indeed, if one would ſtick, without admitting any explication, to the natural ſenſe of theſe words of *Euſebius*, *A quocunque Hæreſis genere*; and of thoſe of the Decree of Saint *Stephen*, *Si quis à quacunque Hæreſi venerit ad nos, nihil innovetur, niſi ut manus ei imponatur in pœnitentiam*; It will ſeem, at firſt ſight, that as St. *Cyprian* was, for having all generally, who had been Baptized by Hereticks, to be Re-baptized; ſo that Holy Pope, on the contrary, forbad the Re-baptizing of any who had been Baptized by Hereticks. And that is alſo the errour that ſome have attributed unto him upon theſe words, *Si quis à quacunque Hæreſi*, which they have taken according to the ſtrictneſs of the Letter. But it is to be confeſſed ingenuouſly, that

Erat id temporis non exigua quæſtio & controverſia excitata, utrum oporteret eos qui ſe à quocunque hæreſis genere revocaſſent, lavacro Baptiſmatis repurgare. Euſeb. *l.* 7. *c.* 2.

as Tradition hath alwhys rejected the Monſtrous Baptiſms of ſome Hereticks, which may be ſeen in *Epiphanius*, who Baptized in a quite different manner from what *Jeſus Chriſt* preſcribes, when he commanded his *Apoſtles* to Baptize in the Name of the *Father*, of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghoſt*; So that Holy Pope, who, with St. *Cyprian*, rejected all theſe falſe Baptiſms, would onely, that the Baptiſm adminiſtred in the Name of the *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghoſt*, by any Hereticks whatſoever, ſhould not be reiterated.

And certainly, without neceſſity of alledging any other proof, that, in my opinion, appears evidently, by that teſtimony of St. *Auguſtine*, which I have juſt now cited: *Stephanus Baptiſmum Chriſti in nullo iterandum eſſe cenſebat*: *Pope Stephen thought, that the Baptiſm of Jeſus Chriſt was to be reiterated in no Heretick.* The Queſtion was onely then about the Baptiſm of *Jeſus Chriſt*, which ordains Baptiſm to be adminiſtred in the Name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and

and of the *Holy Ghoſt*. The *Romans* would have that to ſtand good by what Heretick ſoever it had been conferred; and the *Africans* maintained that it was null, if it was conferred by Hereticks out of the Church, or by Schiſmaticks. And this is the preciſe ſtate of that great Controverſie, betwixt the Pope Saint *Stephen* and St. *Cyprian*, though the Decree of that Pope be not altogether ſo clearly worded as that of St. *Cyprian*.

Aug. *l.* 1. *de Bapt. contra Donat.*

Now this Decree which the Pope grounded wholly upon the ancient cuſtome of the Church, and the Tradition of the *Apoſtles*, having been brought into *Africa*, St. *Cyprian*, and all thoſe of his party, which was very conſiderable, oppoſed it with all their might. For beſides, the *African* Biſhops aſſembled in three Councils, after that of *Agrippinus*, *Firmilian* Biſhop of *Ceſanea* in *Cappadocia*, and moſt of the Biſhops of *Aſia* adhered unto him, and had, as well as thoſe of *Africa*, decided againſt the

Cypr. *Ep.* 74. *& al.*

Firmil. *Epiſt. ap.* Cypr. *Epiſt.* 75. Dionyſ. Alexand. *apud* Euſeb. *l.* 7. *hiſt. c.* 4. *&* 6.

Baptiſm of Hereticks, in the Councils of *Iconium* and *Synnada*, and of many other Cities of *Aſia*, where the Biſhops of *Cappadocia*, *Cilicia*, *Galatia*, *Phrygia*, and other Provinces, aſſembled for examining that Queſtion, which had been the cauſe of ſo great a difference.

Denis Patriarch of *Alexandria*, a Man of extraordinary merit, ſingular learning, and great authority, made it alſo evident enough by his Writings, that they ſhould not offer to condemn that Doctrine which his Biſhops of *Africa* and of *Aſia* maintained to be exactly conform to holy Scripture, affirming, that as there is but one Faith, one Church, and one Baptiſm, this cannot be adminiſtred out of the Church; And as Hereticks can neither abſolve from ſins, nor give the *Holy Ghoſt* by the Impoſition of hands, ſo neither can they Baptiſe. And as to the cuſtome that was objected to them, they abſolutely denied it to have been the practice of the Primitive Church, nor a Tradition

Ibid.

Cypr. *Epiſt.* 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75 & 76.

dition derived from the *Apoſtles*; but on the contrary, ſaid, that theirs was Apoſtolical, and that their practice, being the more ancient, had been obſerved time out of mind in the Church.

Notwithſtanding all theſe reaſons, the Pope continued ſtedfaſt in the reſolution he had taken, of cauſing his Decree to be obſerved, in ſo far, that he cut off from his communion all the Biſhops of *Aſia*, who would not ſubmit to it. And this he did, although *Denis* of *Alexandria* had written earneſtly to him to diſſuade him from it, repreſenting to him, that he might appeaſe him, that Pope *Cornelius*, and the Anti-pope *Novatian* having written to theſe Biſhops, to engage them ſeverally unto their party, they had, in fine, all of them, condemned *Novatian* and his Hereſie, which conſiſted in this, that he maintained, that the Church had not power to reconcile thoſe, who, in time of perſecution, had fallen off to Idolatry.

Dionyſ. Alexand. *apud* Euſeb. *l.* 3. *c.* 4. Firmil. *ap.* Cypr. *Epiſt.* 75.

Cardinal

Cardinal *Baronius* concludes from theſe words of the Holy Patriarch, that the *Aſiaticks* had quitted their opinion concerning the nullity of the Baptiſm of Hereticks. But without doubt that is an evident Anachroniſm, and manifeſt contradiction, which that great Cardinal had not leiſure to mind. For the Patriarch *Denis* ſpeaks onely here of what theſe Biſhops had done under the Pontificate of Pope *Cornelius*; and he prays *Stephen*, the Succeſſour of that Pope, not to uſe them harſhly for the Judgment they are of, that the Baptiſm of Hereticks is null: *Them*, ſays he, *who under his Predeceſſour condemned the Hereſie of Novatian.* Is there any thing clearer, than that *Baronius*, without minding it, hath taken the Counterſenſe? and beſides, *Denis* of *Alexandria* would have had care not to call an opinion, which he believed to be true, an Hereſie.

Firmilian then, and the *Aſiaticks*, perſiſted ſtill in their opinion, as well as

as St. *Cyprian*, the *Africans* and their ſucceſſours, till the deciſion of a General Council, as may be clearly ſeen in an hundred paſſages of the Books of St. *Auſtine*, which he Wrote concerning Baptiſm againſt the *Donatiſts*. I know that St. *Jerome* ſays, in the *Dialogue* againſt the *Luciferians*, that the Biſhops of *Africa* returned to the ancient cuſtome, ſaying, What do we doe? and that abandoning St. *Cyprian*, they made a new Decree conform to that of Saint *Stephen*. But all the Learned agree, that that holy Doctour, who Wrote that *Dialogue* before the moſt part of his other Works, had taken that out of ſome Apocryphal Writings, ſuch as that which bears for Title, *The Repentance of St.* Cyprian; and was declared falſe and ſuppoſititious, in a Synod held at *Rome* Threeſcore and fourteen years before the death of St. *Jerome*. For, to be ſhort, the quite contrary is to be ſeen in the Books of St. *Auſtine* that I have juſt now alledged, in the Letter of Saint *Baſil* to *Amphilochius*, and in the Eighth

Eighth Canon of the first Council of *Arles*.

Now, if during the life of Saint *Stephen*, there were so many Bishops who refused to obey his Decree, there were as many that opposed it after his death. For the Patriarch *Denis* of *Alexandria* Wrote in a high strain to Pope *Sixtus* the Successour of St. *Stephen*, exhorting him to follow a conduct contrary to that of his Predecessour, and not to break, as he had done, with so many Bishops for a constitution contrary to his own; since it had been approved in several Councils; and St. *Jerome* himself, in his *Treatise* of *Ecclesiastical Writers*, which he made long after his *Dialogue* against the *Luciferians*, assures us, that that great Man declared openly for the Doctrine of Saint *Cyprian* and *African* Bishops, and that he thereupon Wrote many Letters which were still extant in his time. That was the cause that the Successours of *Sixtus* entertained Peace with the *African* and *Asiatick* Bishops,

Euseb. *l.* 7. *hist. c.* 4.

Hic in Cypriani *& Africanæ Synodi dogma consentiens de Hæreticis Re-baptizandis, ad diversos plurimas missit epistolas quæ usq; hodie extant.*

Hieron. *de script. Ecclesiast. in* Dionys.

Biſhops, every one freely following their cuſtome and opinion as to that Point, without being blamed for it, untill that a General Council had pronounced Supremely in the matter.

This we learn from St. *Auſtine*, in his Books of *Baptiſm* againſt the *Donatiſts*. Theſe, who began their Schiſm againſt *Cecilian* Biſhop of *Carthage*, in the year Three hundred and two, alledged continually the example of St. *Cyprian*, and of his fellow Biſhops, to juſtifie the conduct which they held, as well as thoſe in Re-baptizing all Hereticks. It is moſt evident, that they durſt not have made uſe of that inſtance, if St. *Cyprian* and thoſe Biſhops had retracted: For St. *Auſtine* would have confounded theſe Schiſmaticks upon the ſpot, by ſaying, that all theſe Biſhops had condemned their former opinion. Yet he never did ſo. On the contrary, he confeſſes, that they always believed that Hereticks muſt be Re-baptized: but

Auguſt. *l.* 1. *de Bapt. contra Donatiſt. c.* 7.

but he adds, that it was lawfull for them to believe it, and for all who have ſucceeded them to doubt of that point, which was then in controverſie, and to diſpute about it. As, indeed, there were many conferences, great diſputes and debates on both ſides concerning it, untill the Church decided that difference, and all ſubmitted to that Sovereign Authority; as St. *Cyprian* would have done without doubt, ſaith St. *Auſtine*, if the whole Church, in a full and general Council had in his time pronounced concerning that point. And becauſe the *Donatiſts* would not ſubmit to the Decree of that Council, in that they added Hereſie to their Schiſm.

Cui & ipſe cederet, ſi jam eo tempore quæſtionis hujus veritas eliquata & declarata per plenarium concilium ſolidaretur. Ibid. c. 4. 89.

Now before we come to ſhew what that General Council decided as to that point, we muſt make a ſerious and ſolid reflexion upon what we have now ſaid, which will ſuffice, to make it clearly out to us what Antiquity hath believed concerning the Infallibility of the Pope.

Here

Here then, we have a Pope of famous memory in the Church, who makes a Decree, whereby he inſtructs all Believers, concerning a point of higheſt importance, where the queſtion is about the validity or nullity of Baptiſm, without which one cannot be ſaved; and by that Decree he pretends to oblige the whole Church to believe, that Hereticks, who are converted, ought not to be Re-baptized, and does ſo pretend it, that he cuts off from his communion great Biſhops, who would not ſubmit to his Decree. And nevertheleſs St. *Cyprian*, all the Biſhops of *Africa*, *Mauritania* and *Numidia*, thoſe of *Cappadocia*, *Cilicia*, *Galatia* and *Phrygia*, *Denis* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and the Biſhops of his Patriarchate, will not receive that ſo ſolemn a Decree of *Stephen* Pope of *Rome*.

Beſides, St. *Auſtine*, and all the *African* Catholicks, united with that great Doctour of the Church againſt the *Donatiſts*, ſay, that before

fore the deciſion of the Council, that came not till long after that Decree of the Pope, it might freely, without making a ſeparation from the Church, be held, what St. *Cyprian* had believed concerning the Baptiſm of Hereticks. In fine, St. *Athanaſius*, St. *Optatus Melevitanus*, St. *Cyril of Jeruſalem*, St. *Baſil*, and ſome others, who have Written as well as they after that General Council, whereof St. *Auſtine* ſpeaks, and before that of *Conſtantinople* have believed, that all Hereticks, who have not the true Faith of the *Trinity*, ought to be Re-baptized, who, in thoſe firſt Ages of the Church, were incomparably more numerous than the other Hereticks, who believed that great Myſtery.

Athanaſ. *Or.* 3. *contra* Arian.
Optat. *l.* 4. *Cont. Parmen.*
Cyril. Hieroſ. *præf. in* Catech.
Baſil. *Epiſt.* 3. *Con.* 47.

Theſe are not bare conjectures that may be doubted of: but uncontroverted matters of fact. A Man needs no more but eyes in his head, to prove them, by Reading the teſtimonies alledged. It muſt neceſſarily then follow, ſeeing

ing they ſubmitted to a Council, becauſe they knew it to be Infallible, which was not done in regard to the Pope St. *Stephen*, that St. *Cyprian*, *Firmilian of Cæſarea*, *Denis of Alexandria*, St. *Athanaſius*, Saint *Optatus*, St. *Cyril of Jeruſalem*, Saint *Baſil*, St. *Auſtine*, and moſt Catholick Biſhops of *Ægypt*, *Aſia* and *Africa*, not to mention thoſe, who, in the interval of almoſt Threeſcore years, that was betwixt Pope *Stephen* and the Council, had liberty to follow the party of St. *Cyprian*, believed not in the Third, Fourth and Fifth Ages of the Church, that the Pope was Infallible. What can be anſwered to that?

Let us now conſult the Council in Queſtion, or rather the Councils which have pronounced Sovereignly concerning that point of the Baptiſm of Hereticks. You have three of them. Firſt, the full Council, which is the firſt Council of *Arles*, to which the Pope St. *Sylveſter* ſent four Legats in the year 314. makes

this Decree, in the Eighth Canon, upon occaſion of the *Africans*, who Re-baptized all Hereticks: *If any Heretick return to the Church, let him be asked the Queſtion; and if it appear that he hath been Baptized in the Name of the* Father, *and of the* Son, *and of the* Holy Ghoſt, *that hands be onely laid upon him, to the end he may receive the* Holy Ghoſt: *but if he anſwer, not according to the Myſtery of the Trinity, let him be Re-baptized.*

De Afris *quod propriâ lege utantur, ut Re-baptiſent, placuit ut ſi ad Eccleſiam aliquis de Hæreſi venerit, interrogent eum ſymbolum, & ſi perviderint eum in patre, & filio, & Spiritu Sancto Baptizatum, manus ei tantum imponatur & ſic accipiat Spiritum Sanctum. Quod ſi interrogatus, non reſponderit hanc Trinitatem Re-baptiſetur.*

Moreover, the great Council of *Nice*, Twelve years after, ordains, in the Canon 19. that the *Paulaniſts* who return to the Church ſhould be Re-baptized, becauſe, as St. *Auſtine* ſays, theſe Hereticks, the Diſciples of *Paulus Samoſatanus*, who believed not the *Trinity*, nor the Incarnation of the *Word*, obſerved not the form of Baptiſm, in Baptizing in the Name of the Three Perſons of the *Trinity*. But as to the *Novatians* who Baptized in the Name of the *Trinity*, as Catholicks did, the Council

De Paulaniſtis *ad Eccleſiam Catholicam confugientibus definitio prolata eſt ut iterum Baptiſentur omnimodis.* Aug. *de hær. ad quod vult Hæreſ.* 44.

Can. 1.

Council declares, that it is ſufficient to lay hands upon them.

In fine, the firſt Council of *Conſtantinople*, which is the ſecond General, ordains alſo the *Montaniſts*, *Sabellians*, and ſuch other Hereticks, who Baptized not in the Name of the Three Perſons of the *Trinity*, againſt which they blaſphemed, ſhould be Re-baptized; but not the *Novatians*, the *Quartodecimans*, nor yet the *Arians* and *Macedonians*, becauſe although theſe had not the true belief which ought to be had of that great Myſtery, yet they Baptized in the Name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghoſt*: which St. *Auſtine*, who hath Written after that Council of *Conſtantinople*, aſſures to be ſufficient for the validity of the Sacrament, though the Faith of him who Baptizes be not pure. *So that*, ſaith he, *if* Marcion *Baptized, uſing the words of the Goſpel, in the Name of the* Father, *Manifeſtum eſt fieri poſſe ut fide non integrâ integrum in quoquam maneat Baptiſmi Sacramentum..... Quamobrem niſi Evangelicis verbis, in nomine Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti* Marcion *Baptiſmum conſecrabat, integrum erat Sacramentum, quamvis ejus fides ſub iiſdem verbis aliud opinantis quam Catholica veritas docet, non eſſet integra.* Aug. *l.* 2. *de Bapt. cont. Donatiſt. c.* 14, 15.

Can. 7.

and of the Son, *and of the* Holy Ghoſt, *his Baptiſm was good, though that Heretick, under theſe words, believed a thing quite different from what the Catholick Church teaches.*

That being ſo, there is no more to be done, but to compare theſe Decrees of Councils with thoſe of the Pope *St. Stephen*, and of Saint *Cyprian*. This Pope Decrees, that if any one return from any Hereſie whatſoever, he ſhall have onely hands laid upon him, without being Re-baptized: *Si quis à quacunque Hæreſi*, &c. St. *Cyprian* ſays on the contrary, that if any one return from any Hereſie whatſoever, he ought to be Re-baptized. Theſe are two extreams, directly oppoſite one to another. The Three Councils take the middle courſe, explaining the one, and condemning the other. They are not for Re-baptizing the *Novatians* and other Hereticks who Baptize in the Name of the Three Perſons of the Trinity, and they hold their Baptiſm to be lawfull

Si quis à quacunq; Hæreſ. &c. manus ei tantum imponatur.

Qui ex quacunque Hæreſi, &c. Baptiſentur.

lawfull and good, according to the true Apoſtolical Tradition; but they are alſo abſolutely for Re-baptizing the *Paulaniſts*, and all ſuch who Baptize not in the Name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghoſt*; thereby clearly defining that their Baptiſm is null. And therein they explain and rectifie the Decree of the Pope St. *Stephen*, adding but in formal terms an exception, which is onely underſtood therein. They plainly then declare on the one hand, how the Decree of St. *Stephen* is to be underſtood; and on the other, that St. *Cyprian*, who expreſſed himſelf clearly enough in his, was deceived, but very innocently; becauſe, as St. *Auſtine* ſays, the truth was not then diſcovered and declared by the Council. Now ſeeing before that Declaration, one might, according to that holy Father, freely follow the opinion of St. *Cyprian*, notwithſtanding the Decree of the Pope, and that after that of the Council one had not the ſame liberty: it is altogether evi-

Nondum veritas eliquata & declarata per plenarium concilium.

L. 1. de Baptiſ. Contra Donatiſ. c. 7, 8, 9, 17.

dent, that it must once more be concluded, that it is, because the ancient Church believed, that a Council is Infallible, and that the Pope is not.

CHAP. X.

CHAP. X.

The fall of Liberius.

THESE two holy Popes, *Victor* and *Stephen*, whom ſo many Catholick Biſhops of the Ancient Church have not believed to be Infallible, had notwithſtanding the truth on their ſide, and in their favours the Councils decided. But there are others, who, according to the unqueſtionable teſtimonies of the Ancients, have fallen into errour: whence it may be irrefragably concluded upon better reaſon, that Antiquity reckoned them not Infallible. I ſhall onely alledge ſeven or eight of the moſt evident inſtances, which will be ſufficient to prove, that the Ancients acknowledged no other Infallibility amongſt Men, but what God hath given to his Church.

The firſt is *Liberius*, who, to get himſelf recalled from the Exile to which the *Arian* Emperour had Ba-

Ann. 357. niſhed him, and to remount the Pontifical Throne which *Felix* had uſurped, ſolemnly approved *Arianiſm*. This he did, by condemning jointly with the *Arians*, St. *Athanaſius*, the great defender of the Faith, and ſcourge of *Arianiſm*; beſides, by ſuppreſſing the Term *Conſubſtantial*, which diſtinguiſhed a *Catholick* from an *Arian*, and which was, in a manner, the Character and Mark of *Catholicity*; nay more, by receiving the moſt obſtinate *Arians* into his Communion; and, in a word, by ſubſcribing to the ſcandalous Formulary of *Sirmium*, which was preſented to him by the Head of the *Semi-Arians*.

And, at length, that it might not be doubted but that he acted as Pope, who makes known to the whole Church what Men ought to believe, for that was the thing the *Arians* pretended to, who were willing it might be known, that the Head of the Church was on their ſide: He Wrote two long Letters, which were made

made publick all over the Empire; one to the Emperour *Conſtantius*, the great Protectour of *Arianiſm*; and the other to the *Arian* Biſhops, wherein he declares his intention in terms moſt ſignificant, and moſt advantagious for the *Arians*.

For there he ſaith, That having known, when it pleaſed God to illuminate him, that they had juſtly condemned *Athanaſius*, he preſently conſented to their Judgment; that he had Excommunicated him; that he would not ſo much as receive his Letters; and that he would have them to know, that he was perfectly united with them in mind and heart: that he profeſſes in that Letter the true Faith, which *Demophilus* had made known unto him, which they had declared and received at *Sirmium*, and that he moſt willingly embraces it without the leaſt contradiction.

This, methinks, may be ſaid to be an Authentick Declaration for *Arianiſm*,

Ubi cognovi quando Deo placuit. Juſſit vos illum condemnaſſe, mox conſenſum meum commodavi ſententiis veſtris. Lib. E. *piſt. 7. ad Epiſc. Orientales.*

Amoto Athanaſio *à communione omnium, cujus nec Epiſtolia à me ſuſcipienda ſunt, dico me cum omnibus vobis pacem & unanimitatem habere; ut ſciatis me veram fidem per hanc Epiſtolam meamloqui: hanc ego libenti animo ſuſcepi, in nullo contradixi,* &c.

nism, and a falling from on high into the Abyss of Heresie. And it cannot be known by a more unquestionable evidence than his own, that he fell so unfortunately. And therefore St. *Hilary*, who lived in that time, most positively calls him Heretick, pronouncing three or four Anathema's against him, one upon the heels of another; And St. *Jerome*, in more than one passage of his Works, says, That that Pope subscrib'd to the *Arian* impiety; and that the vexation he lay under for his Banishment having made him subscribe to Heresie, in a Victorious manner he again entered *Rome*.

In fragment, à Pithæo editis.

Liberius tædio victus exilii, & in hæreticâ prævitate subscribens, Romam victor intraverat.

Hieron. in Chron. & de scrip. Eccles. in Fortunati.

But not to mention all the others who have spoken of that deplorable fall of *Liberius*, we need no other proof fully to perswade us of it, than *Rome* her self and all her Clergy; or to say better, the Church of *Rome*, which so abhorred that scandalous Declaration of *Liberius*, that on the spot she deposed him from his Papacy, as an *Arian* Heretick of publick

Auxili. l. 1. de ordinati. c. 25. & l. 2. c. 1. & alii.

lick notoriety. Nor was he choſen and acknowledged of new for true Pope, till that after his Succeſſour St. *Felix* had ſuffered Martyrdom, he abjured his Hereſie, and was again become the ſame *Liberius* that he was before his fall, a wiſe, generous and zealous Pope. This being ſo, Is it not clear, that the Church of *Rome* her ſelf, in the fourth age, did not believe the Pope to be Infallible?

CHAP. XI.

CHAP. XI.

The inſtance of Pope Vigilius.

THE Second inſtance that I produce, is that of Pope *Vigilius*. I have already related that example upon occaſion of St. *Peter*'s being reproved by St. *Paul*, and ſhall at preſent apply it, in a few, but deciſive words, to the ſubject whereof I treat in this Chapter. This Pope, before the fifth Council, made a Conſtitution, which he addreſſed to the Emperour *Juſtinian*, wherein, amongſt other things, undertaking the defence of the Letter of *Ibas* Biſhop of *Edeſſa*, he declares, that according to the words of that Letter, underſtood in the ſound ſenſe that might be given unto them, it ſeemed to be Orthodox, and ſtrictly prohibits any whoſoever to innovate any thing touching that Letter, in what manner ſoever it might be; nor to condemn it, ſeeing *Ibas* had been abſolv'd, and received as a Catholick

Vigilii *Conſtitutum ad* Juſtin. *Imper.*

Ex verbis Epiſtolæ viri venerabilis Ibæ *reſtiſſimo ac piiſſimo intellectu perſpectis*, &c.

Nec quemquam hoc noſtro conſtituto permittimus aliquando præſumere ſuper ejuſdem Epiſtolæ negotium . . . . . quoquo modo aliquid temerariæ novitatis inferre.

Catholick in the Council of *Chalcedon.*

The Fifth Council which was held ſometime after, and at which *Vigilius* would never aſſiſt, though he was then at *Conſtantinople*, where that Synod was celebrated, decides exactly the contrary. For having well examined the Letter of *Ibas*, concerning which the Council of *Chalcedon* had pronounced nothing, it ſolemnly declares the ſame Heretical and impious, as containing the Blaſphemies of *Theodore* of *Mopſueſtia*, and *Neſtorius* againſt *Jeſus Chriſt* and his holy Mother, and pronounces Anathema againſt all thoſe who Anathematiſe it not, and dare undertake the defence thereof, as if it had been approved in the Council of *Chalcedon.* *Ann.* 553.

Si quis defendit Epiſtolam quam dicitur Ibas *ad* Marim *Perſam ſcripſiſſe, qua abnegat Deum verbum de ſancta Dei genitrice ſemper virgine* Maria *incarnatum hominem factum eſſe, dicit autem,* &c. ..... *& defendit* Theodorum *&* Neſtorium, *& impia eorum dogmata & conſcripta. Si quis igitur memoratam impiam Epiſtolam defendit, & non Anathematizat eam,* &c. .... *& qui præſumit eum defendere; vel inſertam ei impietatem nomine ſanctorum patrum vel Concilii* Chalcedonenſis ..... *Anathema ſit.* Synod. 5. Coll. 3. c. 14.

There you have two decrees quite contrary one to another. Whence it muſt follow, that either the Council in its deciſion, or the Pope in his conſtitution, are deceived, and maintain

maintain an errour. Or whether that Pope did at length consent to that Council, as I have said, upon the credit of very good vouchers, or that he never consented to it, as there are some who affirm: It is certain, that his Successours, *Pelagius* II. and St. *Gregory* the Great have approved it, and that it hath always been received since without contradiction, by all the Western Church, as a true Ecumenical Council which cannot err. It is then most certain that *Vigilius* decided wrong in his constitution, and that by consequent, even according to the Popes and Church of *Rome* in the fifth Age; The Popes, for all they are heads of the Church, are not therefore Infallible.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

The Condemnation of Honorius *in the Sixth Council.*

THE ſame appears clearly alſo, in the caſe of Pope *Honorius*, of whom ſo much hath been Written in theſe later times. I am not for conteſting with any body. I ſhall onely produce matter of Fact, which being barely related, will clearly determine that affair. *Sergius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, being corrupted by *Theodore* Biſhop of *Pharan*, Authour of the Hereſie of the *Monothelites*, who would not acknowledge two Wills and two Operations, the one Divine, and the other Humane in *Jeſus Chriſt*, undertook to ſpread that Hereſie all over the Eaſt.

Lateran. *Synod. ſub-Martr.* 1.

For that end, ſeeing he had already on his ſide *Cyrus* Biſhop of *Phaſis*, who was ſhortly after Patriarch of *Alexandria*, *Macarius* Patriarch of *Antioch*,

Hiſtor. Miſcell. l. 18. Cedren. *&* Zonar. *in* Heracl.

och, and *Athanasius* Patriarch of the *Jacobites*, he acted so cunningly, that being powerfully seconded by these three Bishops, who were much esteemed by the Emperour *Heraclius*, he drew that poor Prince, in his declining Age, into that Heresie. So that he prevailed with him to make that famous Edict under the name of *Ecthesis*, or the exposition of Faith; whereby he commands all his Subjects inviolably to follow that Doctrine. And then that Patriarch of *Constantinople*, having caused it to be signed by all the Bishops of his Patriarchy, whom he had assembled in a Council, he affixed it upon the Doors of his Cathedral Church, at the same time that *Cyrus* planted the same Heresie in *Ægypt*.

Now seeing *Sophronius* Patriarch of *Jerusalem* vigorously opposed it, he caused that pernicious Doctrine, that came near the Errour of *Eutyches*, who confounded the two Natures in *Jesus Christ*, reducing them singly

ſingly into one, to be condemned in his Synod; as the Council of *Chalcedon* had condemned the other. *Sergius* finding himſelf attacked in this manner, wrote a long Letter to Pope *Honorius*, wherein he accuſes *Sophronius* of troubling the Peace of the Oriental Church, by introducing a new Doctrine by theſe new terms of *Two Wills*, and *Two Operations*, which had never been heard of before, neither in the Fathers nor Councils. *Cyrus* failed not to ſecond his Collegue in Impiety, complaining, as he had done, of *Sophronius* to the Pope; And that Patriarch alſo on his part, did what he ought, in defending himſelf well, and in making known to *Honorius* the extreme danger they were in in the Eaſt, of ſeeing errour triumph by power, and by the Artifices of theſe Hereticks, if a ſpeedy courſe were not taken. *Sess. Syn. Act.* 12.

It was never more apparent than on this occaſion, that when the Catholick Faith is to be declared, one muſt never biaſs, nor diſſemble, and

conceal part of truth, for reconciling both parties, and bringing back to the Church thoſe, who, through Hereſie or Schiſm, have ſeparated from it. *Honorius*, who was a very peaceable Man, and ſo zealous for the peace of the Church, that he endeavoured to accommodate all matters, and content both parties, Wrote back to *Sergius*, in a manner, whereby that Patriarch and his party took great advantage, publiſhing, in all places, and perſuading many, by the reading of theſe Letters, That the Biſhop of *Rome*, owned at that time by the *Greeks* for Head of the Church, and Ecumenical Pope, approved their Doctrine; which rendered the party of the *Monothelites* more powerfull than ever.

Sext. Synod. Act. 12.

Hiſt. Miſcel. Cedr. & Zonar.

The Succeſſours of *Honorius*, who in the interim died, took a conduct quite contrary to his, for quenching that great conflagration that ſpread over all the Eaſt. *John* the IV. in his Council of *Rome*, annulled all the Decrees which theſe *Monothelites*

lites had made in their Synods. Pope *Theodore* condemned and depoſed *Pyrrhus*, who ſucceeded *Sergius*, and maintained his Hereſie, and after him his Succeſſour *Paul*, the moſt furious of all thoſe Hereticks, who, as a foaming and raging Bear ravaged the Vineyard of our Lord. For he grew to that height of more than Barbarous fury, as to cauſe the Popes Nuncio's, ſent to *Conſtantinople* for remedying theſe diſorders, to be ſcourged.

Anaſtaſ. *in* Theodor.

The Illuſtrious Pope *Martin*, Succeſſour to *Theodore*, acted more vigorouſly than his Predeceſſour. For in a Council of an Hundred and five Biſhops, which he held at the *Lateran*, where the Writings of the *Monothelites* were examined, with the Petitions that were preſented againſt them, he declared their Doctrine Heretical; Anathematiſed *Theodore* of *Pharan*, *Cyrus* of *Alexandria*, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus* and *Paul*, Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople*, who had always maintained it;

Anaſt. *Vit. S.* Mart. *Pap.*

Exhorted the *Gallican* Church, which hath always vigorouſly defended the Catholick Faith, againſt all Hereſies, to thunder againſt this as he had done; aud ſolemnly condemned the *Ecthesis*, or Edict of the Emperour *Heraclius*. This put the Emperour *Conſtans*, Grandſon of *Heraclius*, and a great Protector of the *Monothelites*, into ſuch a rage, that he cauſed the Holy Pope to be carried away from *Rome*, and having moſt outragiouſly uſed him, Baniſhed him into the *Cherſoneſus*, where, being overwhelmed with miſeries and poverty, he glorioufly accompliſhed a long Martyrdom, which ſhortly after was followed by the deplorable death of that Tyrant.

Epiſt. Mart. *Pap. ad Amand. Trajectenſ.*

Hiſt. Miſc. l. 19. *Anaſt. Vit. S.* Mart. Anaſtaſ. *in S.* Mart. Cedr. *&* Zonar. *in* Conſtante.

His Son *Conſtantine Pogonatus*, a great Catholick, by his prudent conduct, repaired all the faults of that unhappy Prince. For having ſettled the Empire, by the great Victories which he obtained over all his Enemies, he reſolved alſo to give

Peace

Peace to the Church, which his Father had troubled near Fifty years by the *Monothelites*. For that effect, with conſent of Pope *Agatho*, he called the ſixth Council at *Conſtantinople*, where the buſineſs of the *Monothelites* was ſifted to the bottom, and ſovereignly determined to their ſhame. In that Council there were above Two hundred Oriental Biſhops, four Legats of Pope *Agatho*, *Theodore* and *George* Cardinal Prieſts, *John* a Deacon, who was afterwards Pope, and *Conſtantius* Sub-deacon; and on the part of the Council, of Sixſcore Biſhops held for the ſame purpoſe at *Rome*; Three Biſhops, the Deputy of the Archbiſhop of *Ravenna*, and many other Learned Church-men and Monks, who were ſent thither from the Weſtern Church.

Anno 680. *Hiſt. in Miſcel.* Cedr. *&* Zonar. Anaſtaſ. *in* Agath. *Id. & Synod.* 6. *Act.* 9.

The Writings that had paſt on both ſides, upon that ſubject, were read there, and particularly the Letter of *Sergius* to Pope *Honorius*, and the Pope's Anſwer to that Patriarch;

Concil. 6. *Act.* 12.

triarch; And after they had been well examined, this is the Judgment which the Council in the following Seſſion ſolemnly pronounced againſt them, and is the ſame which we have in all the Editions, and particularly in the laſt of *Paris*. *Having found the Epiſtle of* Sergius *to* Honorius, *and that of* Honorius *to* Sergius, *wholly contrary to the Doctrine of the* Apoſtles, *the Definitions of Councils, and the Judgment of the Holy Fathers, and that they were conform to the falſe doctrine of Hereticks, we abſolutely reject and abhor them as pernicious to Souls. We have moreover Judged, that the names of* Theodore, Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, *&c. ought to be blotted out of the Church; and that with them,* Honorius, *heretofore Pope of ancient* Rome, *ought to be Excommunicated, becauſe we have found by his Letters to* Sergius, *that in all things he hath followed the mind of that Heretick, and that he hath confirmed his impious Doctrines.*

Act. 13. *Has invenientes omnino alienas exiſtere ab Apoſtolicis dogmatibus, & à definitionibus Sanctorum Conciliorum, & Cunctorum probabilium Patrum, ſequi verò falſas doctrinas hæreticorum, eas omnino abjicimus, & tanquam animæ noxias execramur, & Honorium qui fuerat Papa antiquæ Romæ eo quod invenimus per ſcripta quæ ab eo facta ſunt ad Sergium quia in omnibus ejus mentem ſecutus eſt & impia dogmata confirmavit.*

The

The holy Council repeats that Condemnation in the definition of Faith, that was made in the Eighteenth Seſſion, and again Anathematiſes him, as alſo the Heretical Patriarchs, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, *Paul* and *Peter* of *Conſtantinople*, *Cyrus* of *Alexandria*, and *Macarius* of *Antioch*, in the thanks that were given the Emperour at the end of the Council; And that Emperour, in his Edict, whereby he Baniſhes the Hereſie of the *Monothelites* out of his Empire, declares the ſame againſt the Heretical Biſhops, and againſt *Honorius*, whom he calls the confirmer of that Hereſie.

Ad hæc & Honorius *Antiquæ* Romæ *Papa hujuſmodi hæreſeos confirmator. Sext. Syn. p.* 1084. *Edit. Pariſ.*

The Council being ended, the Legats brought an Authentick Copy of it to the Pope St. *Leo* II. who ſucceeded *Agatho*, that died during that Council; And this Pope *Leo*, who underſtood Greek very well, took the pains himſelf to Tranſlate it into Latin, ſuch as we have it. Afterwards, Writing to the Emperour, to whom he ſent his Approba-

tion of all the Acts of the Council; he Anathematiſes *Honorius, who enlightned not* (ſays he) *the Apoſtolick Church, by the Doctrine of Apoſtolical Tradition, but who on the contrary endeavoured to deſtroy the Faith.* And in the Letters which he Wrote to the Biſhops of *Spain*, and to the King *Ervigius*, to whom he ſent the Definition of the Council to be ſigned, he expreſſes himſelf as to that point, in words, at leaſt as ſignificant and weighty, ſaying, *That that Pope hath been ſmitten with an Anathema with* Theodore, Cyrus *and* Sergius, *for having conſented that the Immaculate Rule of Apoſtolical Tradition, which he had received from his Predeceſſours, ſhould be corrupted.*

Necnon & Honorium qui hanc ſedem Apoſtolicam non Apoſtolicæ Traditionis Doctrinâ luſtravit, ſed immaculatam fidem ſubvertere conatus eſt. T. 6. Concil. Edit. Pariſ. p. 1027.

Qui immaculatam Apoſtolicæ traditionis regulam, quam à prædeceſſoribus ſuis accepit, maculari conſenſit.

Ibid. p. 1252.

What this Pope, who had Read, Examined, Tranſlated and Approved that Council, ſaid of *Honorius*, other Popes, his Succeſſours, have alſo ſaid in the following Ages. For in the antient Diurnal-book, which is a kind of Ceremonial of the Church

Church of *Rome*, the Confeſſion of Faith, which all the new Elected Popes did make, is to be ſeen, and wherein they declare, That they receive the Sixth General Council, where *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, *Paulus*, &c. inventers of the Hereſie of the *Monothelites* are, ſay they, condemned with *Honorius*, who favoured and countenanced their wicked Doctrines.

Una cum Honorio *qui prævis eorum aſſertionibus fomentum impendit.*

Adrian II. in his *Epiſtle* that was read, and received with applauſe in the ſeventh Action of the Eighth Ecumenical Council, confeſſes, That the *Orientals* pronounced Sentence of *Anathema* againſt *Honorius*, accuſed of the Hereſie of the *Monothelites*; And that great Eighth Council, which ſo ſtrongly maintained the Primacy of the Pope againſt *Photius*, yet for all that, with conſent of the Popes three Legats, who preſided in that Council, in the definition of Faith, they *Anathematiſed Theodore* of *Pharan*, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, &c. and with them *Honorius* Biſhop

Biſhop of *Rome*, *Cyrus* of *Alexandria*, and *Macarius* of *Antioch*.

Theſe are matters of fact to be read in the Councils, and in the Books which I cite; and they are ſo ſtrong and deciſive againſt the Infallibility of the Pope, that *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, *Pighius*, and the other modern Authours, who will abſolutely have the Pope to be Infallible, have been forced to deliver themſelves from the perſecution of thoſe troubleſome matters of fact, to alledge forgery in them, and boldly to ſay, that the Acts of the Sixth Council have been corrupted by *Theodore* of *Conſtantinople*, who, in hatred to the Popes, foiſted in, immediately after the Council, all that concerns *Honorius*; and that the *Epiſtles* of St. *Leo* are falſe, and have been forged by ſome Impoſtour, an enemy of the Holy See. For, ſay they, what likelihood, that after the Letter of Pope *Agatho* had been read in the fourth Action, wherein he ſayth, That the Apoſtolical Church hath never

never ſwerved from the truth, they would have condemned one of his Predeceſſours, and that *Leo* his Succeſſour ſhould doe the ſame?

But they who yield not to that reaſon, nor to ſome other conjectures which they find to be weaker, object reaſons againſt them, which they think can never be anſwer'd. For, ſay they, if that wicked Patriarch had corrupted the Acts, would not the Popes Legats, who preſided in the Council, and brought a Copy of them to *Rome*, have clearly ſeen the Impoſture, and that what was inſerted concerning Pope *Honorius* was no Act of the Council, which had not mentioned him? Would they not have complained to the Emperour of that horrid Cheat? Would they not have told Pope *Leo* that theſe Acts were falſified? Would they have ſuffered, without ſpeaking one word, that he ſhould have Tranſlated them in that manner, to impoſe upon the whole Church? And would the Emperour, who was himſelf preſent at the Council, put into his Edict, that

Honorius

Honorius had been condemned there, or at leaſt would he have ſuffered that Edict to be falſified in his preſence?

Now if any one, to excuſe the Legats and Pope *Leo*, ſhould think fit to ſay, That theſe Acts were not corrupted till long after their death; Might not his mouth be ſtopt with this Reply; To what end then was that Impoſture? Was there not to be found in the Records of the *Vatican* the true Copy of that Council, the Tranſlation of it made by Pope *Leo*, and beſides, a Thouſand Copies of it elſewhere, which might have been oppoſed to thoſe Falſaries for diſcovering their Cheat? Would not Pope *Adrian*, very far from Writing to the Fathers of the Eighth Council, that *Honorius* had been condemned in the Sixth, have advertiſed them, that their Copies were corrupted? Durſt the Fathers have renewed the *Anathema* againſt *Honorius*, and *Adrian*'s three Legats never have oppoſed it? Yet they did no ſuch thing, and there was no complaint made at that

that time that the Acts of the Sixth Council were falſified, becauſe there have never been any other Copies of theſe Acts, either in Writing or in Print, except thoſe which we have, wherein *Honorius* is condemned with *Sergius* and *Pyrrhus*, and the other heads of the *Monothelites*.

As to the *Epiſtles* of Pope *Leo*, Father *Francis Cambefis*, a learned *Jacobin*, hath ſo cleared the truth of them, that at preſent no body doubts of it. And beſides, he hath given us a very rare piece, which alone might end the Controverſie, if there ſtill remained any, about a point ſo fully determined. That is a little work of the Deacon *Agatho* Keeper of the Records, and Vice-Chancellour of the Church of *Conſtantinople*. For he ſaith there, that Officiating as Secretary in the Sixth Council, he Tranſcribed all the Acts with his own hand, which were carefully kept in the Imperial Palace, and that by the command of the Emperour he took five Copies of them, for the five Patriarchs, that ſo the Deciſions of the

Edit. Pariſ. 1648.

the Council might not be altered: by Conſequent, it was one of theſe Copies which the Legats carried to the Pope, who, without doubt, is the firſt of the five Patriarchs. A little after he adds, that *Philippicus*, who, from his youth, was bred in the Hereſie of the *Monothelites*, being advanced to the Empire, cauſed a Picture to be removed from before the Gate of the Palace, before he would enter it, which repreſented the Sixth Council; and commanded that the Images ſhould be ſet up again, and that the Names of *Sergius*, *Honorius*, and of all the reſt who had been *Anathematiſed* in the Holy Ecumenical Council, ſhould be replaced in the Sacred Dypticks.

Id præterea auctoritate decernens, ut Sergii, Honoriiq; ac cæterorum pariter ab eâdem ſanctâ & œcumenicâ Synodo ejectorum nomina in ſacra Eccleſiarum dyptica præconio publico referrentur, eorumq; per loca imagines erigerentur.

So many convincing evidences make it manifeſtly out, that the Acts of that Council have not been corrupted by the *Greeks*. And therefore moſt part of thoſe that ſaid it before, abandoning ſo weak a defence, have retrenched themſelves behind another, ſaying, That the Fathers were miſtaken, in not having rightly underſtood

derſtood the ſenſe and meaning of the *Epiſtles* of *Honorius*, who made uſe of a wiſe diſpenſation for uniting and calming all Winds. But that is a worſe and far more dangerous Anſwer than the former. For it ſtrikes onely at ſome private perſons, who are accuſed, but not known, upon bare conjectures of having falſified the Acts: but the other attacks a whole Ecumenical Council, robbing it of all the authority and force which it ought to have againſt Hereticks.

The truth is, by the ſame liberty that is taken, to ſay, that the Council hath not rightly underſtood the Letters of Pope *Honorius*, though it hath examined them, the *Monothelites*, if there were any at preſent, might ſay, That it hath not rightly underſtood the Scriptures, nor the Fathers, upon the credit of whom it pretends to have rightly condemned the doctrine of *Theodore* of *Pharan*, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, *Paul* of *Conſtantinople*, and of *Macarius* of *Antioch*; and thereby are made uſeleſs all the Decrees of Councils, and all the Conſtitutions of Popes received

received in the Church, which have condemned, as Heretical, certain doctrines, and certain propoſitions particularly pointed at, and contained in the Books of ſome Authours, as the Fathers of the Fifth Council did, in regard of the *Three Chapters*; and in our time Pope *Innocent* X. and *Alexander* VII. in regard of the Book of *Janſenius*.

Theſe are Arguments, which, in my opinion, can never be anſwer'd. But ſince the method of this *Treatiſe* is not the way of Arguments, which draws always Diſpute after it againſt thoſe, who, that they may not ſeem to be at a ſtand, when they are put to it by evident reaſon, never fail of the ſubterfuges of perplexed diſtinctions, which are never well underſtood: I'll keep within the bounds that I have ſet to my ſelf, and onely make uſe of unqueſtionable matters of Fact in Antiquity, that Hiſtory furniſhes us with. Upon that ground then, I ſay, for an Anſwer to both, in the firſt place, that whether the Acts of the Sixth Council

Council have been corrupted, or not, it is certain, that all Antiquity hath received it in the ſame manner as we have it at preſent with the Condemnation of *Honorius*.

That appears, not to ſay any thing of Pope *Leo*, by the Decree of the ſeventh Council; which, as the ſixth did, anathematiſes *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, and *Honorius*; by *Anaſtaſius* the Library-keeper, who certainly ſaw the Copy that was brought from *Conſtantinople*, and who, in the Life of *Leo* II. ſaith, that that Pope received the ſixth Council, where *Cyrus*, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, and *Honorius*, were condemned; by that Letter of *Adrian* II. which I have alledged; by the determination of the eighth Council; and by the Confeſſion of Faith which the ancient Popes made after their Election: nay more than that, by the conſtant Tradition of the *Gallican* Church, as it may be ſeen in the Chronicle of *Ado*, and in the moſt ancient Manuſcript of his Martyrology; which is to

Deteſtamurque cum eâ Sergium, Honorium, &c. Act. ult.

Anaſtaſ. in Vit. Leon. & Epiſt. ad Joan. diacon.

Ann. 6.

be found in the *Mazarine Bibliotheke.*

This is alſo to be ſeen in the Opuſcles of *Hincmar* Archbiſhop of *Reims*, where he puts the Condemnation of *Honorius* in the ſixth Council, with that of the other *Monothelites.* And for that very reaſon it was, that writing to Pope *Nicolas* I. he ſaith, That it is known that all the Churches of *France* are ſubject to that of *Rome*, and that all the Biſhops are ſubjected to the Pope by reaſon of his Primacy; and that therefore they ought all to obey him: but *ſalva fide*, adds he, *the Faith being ſecured*; which it is moſt clear he would not have added, had it not been believed in *France*, as elſewhere, that Popes might err, as well as Pope *Honorius.* In fine, for an authentick Confirmation of all this, there is no Author to be found, who, before ſome Moderns of the laſt Age, durſt ſay, even contrary to the Tradition of the Church of *Rome*, that the Acts of the ſixth Council have been corrupted by the *Greeks.* This

Opuſc. de non Trin. unit.

Opuſc. 33. *c.* 20.

Apud Flodard. l. 3. Hiſt. *c.* 13.

This is ſo true, that in the ancient *Breviary* of *Rome* printed at *Venice* in the year 1482, and 61 years after at *Paris*, in the Year 1543, after that it is ſaid in the firſt Leſſon of the ſecond Nocturn of the Office of St. *Leo*, on the eight and twentieth of *June*, *Hic ſuſcepit ſanctam ſextam Synodum*; in the ſecond it is to be read. *In qua ſynodo damnati ſunt Cyrus & Sergius, Honorius, Pyrrhus, Paulus*, &c. But in the new *Breviary* the Name of *Honorius* is left out, and it hath been thought ſufficient to put into that ſecond Leſſon, *In eo Concilio Cyrus, Sergius, & Pyrrhus, condemnati ſunt.* Whereupon it is eaſie to conclude from moſt manifeſt matters of Fact alone, that all Antiquity, Oecumenick Councils, Popes, all the *Gallican* Church, nay and even the Church of *Rome*, until the laſt Age, have believed that the ſixth Council received by all the Church, hath condemned Pope *Honorius*, and ranked him amongſt *Monothelite* Hereticks. Whence it clearly

follows, That Antiquity hath believed, that the Pope was not infallible. The ſame may be ſaid to thoſe who maintain, that the Council, in condemning the Epiſtles of *Honorius* to *Sergius*, did not rightly underſtand them. Whether that be ſo or no, it is certain, according to your ſelves, that it condemned them: Then a whole great Council of above two hundred Biſhops of the ſeventh Age, repreſenting the Univerſal Church in her Paſtors lawfully aſſembled, did not believe the Pope to be Infallible; for had they been of that Belief, they would have had a care whether they had well or ill underſtood theſe Letters, not to have anathematiſed him as they did.

The Reſult of all is, That Antiquity, in the Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Ages, as well as in thoſe that preceded, hath believed that the Pope was not Infallible. This is it that I was to prove; leaving the Modern Doctors who hold his Infallibility, to their Liberty of think-

thinking and ſaying thereupon, whatever they pleaſe, by Logick, that can never overthrow the truth of matters of Fact which I have produced, and which make known to us what Antiquity hath believed concerning the Infallibility of the Pope.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Popes Clement *III.* Innocent *III.* Boniface *VIII.* *and* Sixtus *V.*

SUch as apply themſelves to the Study of Antiquity, find, that in the Ages following there have been other Popes that have erred in their Deciſions; as theſe that follow. In the twelfth Age, *Clement* III. declared in his Decretal, *Laudabilem*, That the Wife of an Heretick being converted, and her Husband continuing obſtinate in his Hereſie, might be married to another; which, doubtleſs, neither Ca-

Cleric. C. Quarto de Divortiis.

tholicks nor Proteſtants could at preſent ſuffer to be brought into practice. And therefore Pope *Innocent* III. who filled the Holy See ſhortly after *Clement*, recalled that Conſtitution; thereby plainly declaring, that his Predeceſſor had erred. This is affirmed by Cardinal *Cortzeon*, who flouriſhed in the Pontificat of *Innocent* III. in his Sum, which I have ſeen in Manuſcript in the Abbey Royal of St. *Victor*. And this ſame Pope *Innocent* himſelf, for all he was ſo able a man, was ſubject to the ſame failing, from which Popes, according to the Belief of Antiquity, are not exempted; that is, to be deceived, even when they decide a point of Doctrine in their Council, without the Conſent of the Church.

Lib. 3. Hiſtoriar. Memorab. c. 32. The matter of Fact is related by *Cæſarius* a *Ciſtercian* Monk, and contemporary with *Innocent*. He ſays, that a Monk of his Order, who, without doubt, before he entered the Monaſtery, had given it out that he was a Prieſt, committed daily

daily a dreadful Sacriledge, in celebrating *Maſs*, though he had never received ſacred Orders. Having confeſſed this to his Abbot, who failed not to enjoyn him, as he ought, to abſtain from ſaying it for the future, he would not obey him: for on the one hand he feared, that by refraining he ſhould diſgrace himſelf, and give occaſion to his Brethren to think ill of him; and on the other, he thought he had no cauſe to apprehend that his Abbot, to whom he had diſcovered his Crime under the inviolable Seal of Confeſſion, durſt do him any prejudice becauſe of that Diſcovery.

The Abbot being in great perplexity, bethought himſelf to propoſe this Caſe, in general Terms, in a Chapter of his Order that was held ſome time after: and asking the Queſtion, what was to be done if ſuch a Caſe ſhould ever happen in their Monaſteries; the whole Aſſembly were as much puzled as the good Abbot had been; and nei-

ther the Chapter of the *Ciſtertians*, nor any of the reſt, durſt ever undertake to decide that caſe of Conſcience, which was thought to be ſo difficult, that it was reſolved upon, by all, to write about it to the Pope for a Reſolution.

Innocent III. the then Pope, aſſembled thereupon, the Cardinals, Doctors, and Learned Men, to take their Advice; who, after ſome debate, agreed all in his Judgment: to wit, That ſuch a Confeſſion being rather Blaſphemy than a Confeſſion, the Confeſſor, in ſuch a caſe, ought to diſcover ſo horrible a Crime, becauſe it might bring great prejudice to the Church. And the Year following he wrote to the Chapter what he had determined, and what was approved in that great Congregation of Cardinals. It is not at all to be doubted, but that that Definition is wrong. So that the ſame Pope, a little after, made no Scruple to retract it in the great Council of *Lateran* where he himſelf preſided, which poſitively

Et placuit ſententia omnibus, ſcriptſique ſequenti anno Capitulo quod fuerat à ſe determinatum, & à Cardinalibus approbatum.

Ann. 1215.

tively declared the contrary in theſe Terms: *Let the Prieſt have a care that he diſcover not, either by Word, Sign, or in any other way whatſoever, the Sin of his Penitent. That if any one,* adds it, *preſume to reveal the Sin that hath been diſcovered to him at the Tribunal of Confeſſion, we ordain, not only that he be depoſed from the Sacerdotal Office, but alſo that he be confined to a Monaſtery, there to do Penance during Life.*

Caveat ſacerdos ne verbo, vel ſigno, vel alio quovis modo prodat aliquatenus peccatorem. Qui peccatum in pœnitentiali Judicio ſibi detectum præſumpſerit revelare, non ſolum à ſacerdotali officio deponendum decernimus, verum etiam ad agendam perpetuam pœnitentiam in arctum Monaſterium detrudendum.
Conc. Later. 4. c. 21.

Theſe are two quite oppoſite Deciſions upon a Point of higheſt Importance, and which concerns a Sacrament; one of the Pope with his particular Council, or his Council of Cardinals, Prieſts, and Deacons, who repreſent the Church of *Rome*; the other of the ſame Pope, with a great Council, repreſenting the Univerſal Church. Whence comes that difference, if it be not, That the Pope pronouncing and deciding upon any Point concerning Doctrine and Manners in a general Council, or with the Conſent of the Church, is Infallible; and when

when he acts otherwise he is not.

This appears still more manifestly in the Bull, *Unam Sanctam*, of *Boniface* VIII. whereby that Pope, whose History is sufficiently known, proposes to all Believers, as an Article of Faith, the Belief whereof is necessary to Salvation, That Popes have a Supream Power over all the Kingdoms of the World, as to the Temporal. It was believed then in all these Kingdoms, and is so still, that that Definition is wrong. Even they themselves who hold that the Pope hath some Power over the Temporal, have a care not to say, That one is obliged to believe it upon pain of Damnation: and it is known that *Clement* V. recalled that Bull in the Council of *Vienna*. That Pope then, and that Council in the fourteenth Century, believed not that the Pope was infallible.

Cap. meruit. de Privilegiis.

The same may be said of the Bull of *Sixtus* V. which he caused to be printed with his Bible, and whereby he declares to the whole Church, That that Bible is corrected according

ding to the Primitive Purity of the Vulgar Tranſlation. And nevertheleſs, becauſe it was afterwards clearly ſeen that it was not, *Clement* VIII. ſuppreſſed that Bull, and cauſed another to be printed, wherein all the Faults of the former are very well corrected: and ſo it may very well be concluded, that *Clement* VIII. was perſuaded, that his Predeceſſor, inſtructing all Believers in a point that regards even the Principle of *Faith*, might be deceived. However, I will not ſay ſo, becauſe I will not at all enter into Diſpute with ſome Modern Doctors, who, to ſlip the Collar, have bethought themſelves to ſay, That it is true the Bull was printed with the Bible, which is ſtill to be ſeen in many Libraries, but that it was not affixed upon the Gates of St. *Peter*'s Church, and on the Field of *Flora*, ſo long as it ought to have been, according to the Laws of the Chancery of *Rome*. As if the Truth or Falſhood of the Contents of a Bull,

Tannerus diſp. 1. de Fide, q. 4. dub. 6. n. 263.
Thom. Comptonus in 2. 2. diſ. 22. de ſum. pontif. ſect. 5.

Bull, depended on the time that is to be taken in publiſhing it; and as if the Pope who makes it, became not Infallible but at the preciſe Minute of the Accompliſhment of the time that it ſhould have been affixed. Let us leave that Inſtance then of *Sixtus* V. that we may not engage into that Sophiſtry of Diſputation, which to me ſeems not altogether ſo ſerious in a matter of that Importance.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

The Inſtance of Pope John *XXII.*

I Shall produce no more Inſtances but that of Pope *John* XXII. That Pope, in his extream old Age of near fourſcore and ten Years, took a Conceit, that as a certain and conſtant Truth, the Opinion of ſome ought to be eſtabliſhed in the Church, who had heretofore taught that the Souls of thoſe who died in Grace, and had been entirely purged from all the remaining dreggs of their Sins, did not ſee the Face of God till after the Reſurrection. He did all that lay in his Power to have it paſs. He taught it publickly in Conferences and Congregations which he held upon that Subject: he preached it himſelf; he obliged, by his Example, the Cardinals and Prelates of his Court, and other Doctors, openly to maintain it. He cauſed a learned *Jacobin*, named

Contin. Hangii.

named *Father Thomas de Valas*, to be put in Prison; who not doubting but that Opinion was an Error contrary to the expres Word of the Son of God, who said to the good Thief, *This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise*, preached the contrary even in *Avignon*, where the Pope held his Court. In fine, I find a Doctor of very great Authority, whose eminent Virtue and singular Learning; with a consummated Prudence in the management of Affairs, raised him afterwards to the highest Dignity of the Church, that says very plainly, That he obliged all men to hold that Doctrine for the future.

Ibid. & *Gobel.* persona in *Cosmodr. æt.* 6. c. 71. *Paul Langius* in Chron. Citizen.

Hadrian. 6. in 4. sentent. art. 3. de Minist. Confirm. 22.

Publicè docuit, declaravit, & ab omnibus teneri voluit, quod animæ, &c.

Be as it will, it is certain that he did what lay in his Power to bring into his Opinion the Sacred Faculty of Theology and University of *Paris*, which was by all men reverenced as the Mother of Sciences; that for that end he sent thither two Doctors with the General of the *Cordeliers* who publickly maintained that Doctrine, and preached the same;

ſame; which ſtirred up all *Paris* againſt them. Whereupon, King *Philip de Valois* cauſed all the Biſhops and Abbots that then were at *Paris*, to aſſemble with the Doctors of the Faculty; who in his Preſence confounded thoſe of *Avignon*, and proved to them, that what they had preached by order of the Pope, was heretical. Continu. Hangii.

That Prince, who would ſuffer in his Kingdom no Novelty of Doctrine, wrote to his Holineſs with a great deal of Force and Reſpect, beſeeching him to retract that wicked Opinion, which cauſed ſo much Scandal in the Church. Nay he prayed him to ſend a Legate into *France*, who in his Name might approve and confirm the Decree of the Doctors of *Paris*, who knew far better what was to be believed as a matter of Faith, than his Canoniſts and other Clergy of *Avignon*, that were no great Divines.

Quatenus ſententiam Magiſtrorum de Pariſiis qui melius ſciunt quid debet teneri & credi in fide, quam Juriſta & alii Clerici, qui parum aut nihil ſciunt de Theologia, approbaret. Ibid.

The Pope, who would neither wholly retract, nor yet on the other hand provoke the King, whoſe Pro-

Protection he ſtood in need of, took a middle Courſe, which he thought would not be diſagreeable unto him, and prayed him to be ſatisfied, that every one might continue in their Opinion, and Say, Teach, and Preach, what they thought good upon that Subject. As to that Propoſition, the King would again have the Advice of the Faculty, whom he there aſſembled; and the Faculty by a Decree of the Second of *January*, One thouſand three hundred and three, at the *Mathurins*, declared of new, That the Opinion in queſtion was Heretical, and that by conſequent it could neither be Preached nor Taught. After that, *Philip* proſcribed it by Sound of Trumpet, prohibiting all his Subjects to teach or maintain it: and then, that he might oblige the Pope to condemn it, he wrote to him a ſecond time in ſo forcible and extraordinary Terms, that at length the Pope retracted it a little before his Death, which hapned the Year following.

Epiſt. Joan. ad Philip. 14. *Calend. Decemb. Pontif.* 12.

Joan. Gerſon. Serm. in die Paſchat. coram Rege.
Petr. de Alliac. prop. de toll. ſc. coram Rege. An. 1406.
Gob. Perſo.
Langius
Odor. Rayn. ad An. 1334.

I have

I have ſaid all that I could, in my Hiſtory of *the Fall of the Empire* to excuſe him, even ſo far as to affirm with ſome, that that Doctrine which he would have eſtabliſhed by his own Authority, was not as yet condemned, as it was afterwards by *Benet* XII. his Succeſſor.

There are ſome notwithſtanding who ſay, that it had been long before rejected by the *Roman* Church, as appears by the Confeſſion of Faith that *Clement* IV. ſent in the Year Two hundred threeſcore and ſeven, to the Emperour *Michael Paleologue*, whereof I have ſpoken in my Hiſtory of the Schiſm of the *Greeks*. However it be, it is certain that it is an Error, condemned not only by Pope *Benet*, but much more ſolemnly, above an hundred Years after, in the third Article of the Definition of Faith which the Council of *Florence* made for reuniting the two Churches. And ſeeing it was not doubted but that Pope *John* XII. in the

manner he ſet about it, acted with all his Authority and Force to introduce and eſtabliſh that Error in the Church; ſo alſo was it believed in that Fourteenth Age, that the Pope teaching the Church might err, and that he is not Infallible, but when he pronounces from the Chair of the Univerſal Church, as Head of it, in a general Council, or with conſent of the principal Members of the Church, who are the Biſhops.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

The Tradition of the Church of Rome *as to that.*

IT will be no difficult Task for us to prove that that Doctrine is conform to the conſtant Tradition of the Church of *Rome*, as appears by the conduct of ancient Popes, who in great Controverſies about Faith, after that they themſelves had pronounced againſt Error, have thought that for condemning it by a ſovereign and infallible Sentence, there was need of a Council, or at leaſt by another way, the conſent of the Church: *Ut pleniori Judicio omnis poſſit error aboleri*; *to the end that Error might be aboliſhed by a more ſolemn and deciſive judgment*, ſaid the great St. *Leo* writing to the ſecond Council of *Epheſus*, though he himſelf had already condemned *Eutyches* in his particular Council which for that end he held at *Rome*.

Ep. 15. *ad Epheſ. concil.*

This hath been confirmed by the Popes of the last Age, when that after *Leo* X. had published his Bull against the Errors of *Luther*, they declared in their Bulls, speaking of the Council of *Trent* which was called for the supreme Decision of that Controversie, that that was the last and necessary Remedy, which had always been made use of by their Predecessors on the like Occasions. Wherein all the Popes perfectly well agree with the fifth Council; which for proving that necessity, alledges the Example of the Apostles, who decided in common with St. *Peter*, the Question touching the Observation of the Law of *Moses*, and then declares, that otherways Truth cannot be found in Controversies that arise about the Faith. It is evident by that, that the Popes and that Council did not believe that the Pope was infallible: for had they believed him infallible, they would also have been persuaded, that it was sufficient to consult that Oracle,

Solumq; Concilium generale remedium à nostris prædecessoribus, in casu simili usurpatum supersesse. Clem. VII. in Bull. indict. Concil. 1533.

Tam necessarium opus. Pius IV. in Bull. confirm.

Nec enim potest in communibus de fide disceptationibus aliter veritas manifestari.

cle, or, that after his Reſponſes and Deciſions, it would not have been neceſſary, for aboliſhing Error entirely, to have recourſe to the determination of the Church repreſented by a Council.

But if it be ſaid, that there are ſome Hereſies which the Popes alone have condemned, and which have always been reckoned lawfully condemned, without the Interpoſition of a Council; it is eaſily granted: but at the ſame time it may be ſaid, that that concludes nothing at all, becauſe in the three firſt Ages of the Church there were Hereſies, ſuch as that of *Cerinthus*, of the *Ptolemaits*, the *Severians*, *Bardeſanites*, *Noetians*, *Valeſians*, and many others, that ſingle Biſhops or particular Synods have condemned, and which we are obliged to account Hereſies, tho neither Popes nor General Councils have had any hand in their Condemnation. Not that theſe Biſhops and Synods are infallible, but becauſe all the other Biſhops

who abominated these Heresies as much as they, condemned them as they had done, by approving all that they had done. So when Popes have decided against any Doctrine which is afterward to be esteemed heretical, it is so, because they have defined with consent of the Church, which hath received their Constitutions; as we have in our days seen an illustrious Instance of it.

That which more confirms that ancient Tradition of the *Roman* Church, is, the great number of Popes, who condemning some of their Predecessors, after Oecumenical Councils, have thereby declared, that they themselves no more than others, have not received of God the gift of Infallibility, which he hath only bestowed upon his Church. And indeed, two great Popes of the last Times were so fully persuaded of this, that they would not accept of it from the hands of men that would have attributed it unto them.

The

The firſt is *Adrian* VI. who in his Commentaries upon the fourth of the Sentences, ſays poſitively, and in a moſt deciſive manner, that he is certain the Pope may err, even in matters belonging to the Faith, teaching and eſtabliſhing a Hereſie by his Definition or by his Decretal; which afterwards he proves by many Inſtances; and very far from following *Pius* II. and changing Opinion as he did when he came to be Pope, he perſiſted in it ſo conſtantly, that he thought fit, during his Pontificat, that a new Edition of his Book ſhould be printed at *Rome*, exactly conform to that which he publiſhed when he was Doctor and Dean of *Louvain*, wherein that Paſſage is entire, without the Omiſſion or Alteration of one ſingle Word.

Art. 3. de Mineſ confirm.

Certum eſt quod Pontifex poſſit errare, etiam in iis quæ tangunt fidem, hæreſim per ſuam determinationem aut decretalem aſſerendo.

The ſecond is *Paul* IV. who before his promotion to the Papacy had been great Inquiſitor, the moſt ſevere and zealous that ever was for the preſervation of the purity of the Catholick Faith againſt all

Relat. Joann. Hay. Pariſ. Theol. Addit. aux mem. de Caſtelnam. *t.* 2. *b.* 6:

Num matrimonium per verba de præsenti contractum, quod est verum matrimonium & verum sacramentum juxta fidelium Theologorum sententiam, auctoritate nostra dissolvi possit, intelligo cum carnalis nulla conjunctio intercesserit.

Heresies. This Pope, in the Year One thousand five hundred and fifty seven, held a great Congregation of Cardinals, Bishops, and Doctors, at *Rome*, for the examining that important question, Whether by the power of the Keys which Jesus Christ had given him, as Successor to St. *Peter*, he could dissolve the Marriage which the Mareschal of *Montmorency* had contracted in formal terms *de præsenti*, with the Lady *de Piennes*.

Having proposed the matter to them, by giving them to understand, that the Question was about the deciding of a Point of very great Importance, concerning a Sacrament, he declared to them, that he would not have them alledge to him the Examples of his Predecessors, that he would not follow them, but in so far as they were conform to the Authority of Holy Scripture, and solid Reasons of Divinity. *For I make no doubt*, added he, *but that my Predecessors and I may fail, not only in this, but in many other things:* Which

Non dubito quin ego & decessores mei errare aliquando potuerimus, non solum in hoc, sed etiam in pluribus aliis rerum generibus.

Which he even proved by Teſtimonies of Scripture, which teacheth us, that God permits that men ſhould for a time be ignorant of that which afterwards he diſcovers to his Church. *Who knows then now,* ſaid he, *but that God may manifeſt by our means, what others have not known touching the indiſſolvable Bond of Marriage? Wherefore, have no reſpect to Examples, and don't tell me what this man or that man of my Predeceſſors have determined about this matter in a like Caſe Conſider only whether theſe Popes have underſtood rightly or not what they have decided concerning this matter of Marriage which we examine.*

Nec rationem habere ullam exempli quod hic vel ille deceſſor meus, &c.

Perſpicite an deceſſores noſtri id ſatis intellexerint quod de indiſſolubili matrimonii vinculo diſquirimus.

There is a Pope, who doubtleſs will never be accuſed of having failed in maintaining the pontifical Authority, that nevertheleſs frankly confeſſes, and in very plain terms, that he and his Predeceſſors may have erred in Deciſions that they may have made concerning points relating to the Faith. So that from all that I have hitherto ſaid upon that

that Subject it may evidently be concluded, That great Saints of the ancient Church, Biſhops in all parts of Chriſtendome, in the *Eaſt*, in the *Weſt*, and in *Africa*, full and general Councils, ancient Popes who have either preſided in or conſented to theſe Councils; in a word, that all Antiquity hath believed, that the Pope deciding by his pontifical Authority, without the conſent of the Church, is not at all infallible.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

The ſtate of the Queſtion touching the Superiority of a Council over the Pope, or of the Pope over a Council.

IF I proceeded in this Treatiſe by way of Diſcourſe and Argument, I might ſoon conclude, and not fear that any Objection could be brought againſt my Concluſion: for if Antiquity hath believed as I think I have demonſtrated, that the Pope is not Infallible, and that he may be deceived in his Decrees; it's moſt evident, that it hath alſo believed by neceſſary conſequence, that the Tribunal of the Univerſal Church, which without contradiction is infallible, and repreſented by a general Council, is above that of the Pope. But becauſe for avoiding of Diſpute, I only alledge evident matters of Fact, againſt which all the Arguments in the World can never prevail; for, in fine, can one

one by dint of Argument make that which has been, never to have been? I ſhall only relate what the Ancient Church hath believed touching that famous Queſtion. Seeing the State of the Queſtion ought plainly and without Ambiguity to be propoſed, for avoiding perplexity, to the end that people may at firſt agree about the thing that is in queſtion, and that it may not be ſaid as it oftentimes happens after much jangling and diſpute without concluding any thing; that the thing was underſtood in a quite different ſenſe than it was propoſed in: Take therefore the ſtate of the Queſtion as follows.

It is enquired, Whether after that a Council is lawfully aſſembled, the Pope who without contradiction is Head of it, preſiding in it in perſon, or by his Legates, or not being preſent nor preſiding therein either the one way or t'other, as it hath happened oftner than once, and is to be ſeen in the ſecond Oecu-

Ann. 381. menical Council of an hundred and fifty

fifty Biſhops, and in the fifth of above an hundred and ſixty: Whether, I ſay, that Council conſidered in its Members united, either under the Pope who has Right to preſide in it, or failing of him, under another Preſident, is above the Pope, and hath ſovereign Authority over him, ſo that he is obliged to ſubmit to its Decrees and Definitions, to approve them and conſent thereunto as all others are, though he be in his own particular, of a contrary Judgment; or whether the Pope is ſo above all the other Members of that Council united together, be he there or not, that if he approve and confirm not by his Aſſent and Authority the Decrees and Definitions thereof, That Council has no Authority, neither over Him nor over Believers? *Ann.* 553.

In this preciſely conſiſts that Queſtion which hath not been moved in the Church, but ſince the Council of *Piſa*, ſome two hundred and forty Years ago. And the reaſon why it was never ſpoken of *Ann.* 1409.

be-

before, is, becauſe it was not at all doubted in the Ancient Church, but that a Council was above the Pope. I ſhall make it out by matters of Fact, againſt which no Reply can be made.

CHAP. XVII.

That it is the Holy Ghoſt, which in the Definitions of Faith pronounces by the Mouth of the Council.

ANtiquity hath always believed, as it is believed at this day, That the Council held at *Jeruſalem* concerning the Legal Obſervations, to which many amongſt the converted *Jews* pretended that all who embraced the Faith of the Goſpel were tied, hath been a pattern to all Oecumenical Councils which have been ſince celebrated in the Church for the ſupreme Deciſion of other points of Controverſie, which have often divided Chriſtians into very different Opinions: and

and when the matter in queſtion had been well examined, the Decree that paſs'd in that Council proceeded from the Holy Ghoſt, which was uttered in theſe Words, *Viſum eſt ſpiritui ſancto & nobis.* It hath ever ſince alſo been believed, that when other Councils, after an exact Enquiry into the Truth, defined what was to be believed, or what was to be done, it is the Holy Ghoſt that ſpeaks in their Decrees; and that it may truly be ſaid, as it was ſaid at *Jeruſalem*, *It hath ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt and to this Aſſembly.* This hath been expreſſed by St. *Leo*, in theſe terms, which have been received with ſo much Applauſe in the whole Church, when he ſaith in one of his Epiſtles, That the Canons of the holy Fathers have been made by the Spirit of God, and that they are conſecrated by the Veneration of the whole Earth.

Sanctorum patrum canones ſpiritu Dei conditi, & totius mundi reverentia conſecrati. St. *Leo* Epiſt. 84. ad Anaſt. Theſſalonic.

Now it is certain, that St. *Peter* depended upon the Holy Ghoſt as well as St. *James*, St. *John*, St. *Paul*, St.

St. *Barnaby*, the Elders, and other Brethren who were preſent in that Council; and if after that he compelled by his Example the Chriſtians to Judaiſe, as Cardinal *Baronius* hath thought, he had been much more to be blamed for having diſobeyed the Holy Ghoſt and the Council, than when St. *Paul* rebuked him openly before the Council; as I have made it clearly out by the Teſtimony of the Fathers, and of Pope *Pelagius* II.

So that it ought to be concluded, that the Pope, who is no leſs inferiour to the Holy Ghoſt than St. *Peter* to whom he ſucceeds, is obliged to ſubmit to his Judgment againſt his own, to obey and conſent to his Deciſions, and conſequently to thoſe of the Council, who neither ſpeaks nor decides but with the Holy Ghoſt, according to thoſe high Words which contain all the Force, Authority, and Soul of Oecumenical Councils; *Viſum eſt ſpiritui ſancto & nobis.*

This

This is ſo true, that if after the great Council of *Nice*, for example, defined by Plurality of Voices, that the *Word* is conſubſtantial to the Father, the Pope St. *Sylveſter* had not received that definition, and believed the Conſubſtantiality of the *Word*, as the *Arians* did not, he would have been reckoned an Heretick as well as they. And therefore he failed not to conſent to the Decrees of that Council, by approving and confirming them by his own Aſſent, and by the Aſſent of the Biſhops whom he had aſſembled at *Rome* upon that occaſion. *I offer you*, ſays he, in his Epiſtle to the Fathers of *Nice*, if that Letter be true, as Cardinal *Baronius* thinks, *I offer you my Hand, and that of my Diſciples, for conſenting with you to all that ye have determined in your holy Council.*

Meum chirographum & diſcipulorum meorum in veſtro ſancto concilio quicquid conſtituiſtis una parem dare conſenſum. T. 1. Concil.

And it's that preciſely which in the Ancient Church is called the confirming of a Council; to wit, to conſent by Vote and an authentick Act to what hath been eſtabliſhed

in it. That appears evidently by the Letters of two great Popes, St. *Leo*, and St. *Martin*. The Council of *Chalcedon* made Decrees concerning the *Faith*, for condemning the Hereſie of the *Eutycheans*, and the Remains of that of the *Neſtorians*, and by the eight and twentieth Canon thereof, to honour the Imperial City, the ſecond place among the Patriarchs was given to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*: which is contrary to the Council of *Nice*, that diſpoſed of it otherways; and to which St. *Leo* alſo would never condeſcend, what Inſtance ſoever the Fathers of *Chalcedon* made to him for it.

He was nevertheleſs apprehenſive, that this might have a bad Effect, and that becauſe of that Refuſal it might be thought in the World, that he would not conſent to the determinations of that Council which had ſo well aſſerted the Faith, againſt the Hereſie of *Eutyches*; therefore he wrote to them

in

in theſe terms: *Leſt by malign Interpreters of my Intentions it might ſeem doubtful whether or not I approve what you have with unanimous Conſent determined concerning the Faith, in the Council of* Calcedon; *I write to all my Brethren and Fellow-Biſhops theſe Letters, which the moſt glorious Emperour, as he hath deſired, will deliver unto you, to the end your Fraternity, and all Believers, may know, that not only by the Approbation of my Legates, but alſo by my own, I have joyned my Judgment to yours, but only in thoſe Points which concern the Faith, for the ſake of which this Univerſal Council hath been celebrated by the expreſs Order of the Emperours, and the Conſent of the Holy Apoſtolick See.* You ſee then, that to approve a Council, according to St. *Leo*, is to conform in Judgment to that of the Fathers, and to conſent to the Definitions that have been made in it.

Ne per malignos interpretes dubitabile videatur utrum quæ in Synodo Chalcedonenſi *per unanimitatem veſtram de fide ſancta ſunt approbem, hæc ad omnes fratres & Coepiſcopos noſtros ſcripta direxi.--Ut & fraternitas veſtra & omnium fidelium corda cognoſcant, me non ſolum per fratres qui vicem meam exercuiſſunt, ſed etiam per approbationem geſtorum ſynodalium propriam vobiſcum iniiſſe ſententiam in ſola fidei cauſa, &c.* St. *Leo* Epiſt. 61. Syn. Chalced.

This is ſtill more clearly apparent by the circulatory Letter which the Pope St. *Martin* wrote to St. *Amand*

Biſhop of *Utrecht*, and to all the Biſhops of *France*, ſending them the Acts of the Council of an hundred and five Biſhops whom he had aſſembled at *Rome* againſt the *Monothelites*; and exhorting them to ſubſcribe to them in a Council of the *Gallican* Church, and to ſend them back to him with their Subſcriptions, whereby we may ſee, *That they confirm and conſent to all that hath been defined in the Council of* Rome, *for the Catholick Faith, and for overthrowing that furious Hereſie which of late hath riſen againſt the Church.* He deſires that the Biſhops of *France* may confirm the Deciſions of *Rome* concerning a Point relating to Faith: it is not, for all that, to be ſaid, that the *Gallican* Church is ſuperiour to the *Roman*; and there would be no reaſon to ſay ſo, becauſe to confirm Definitions, is nothing elſe, as St. *Martin* explains himſelf, but to conſent unto them by Vote and Suffrage.

Ann. 549.

Secundum tenorem Eccleſiaſtica à nobis directa ſcripta una cum ſubſcriptionibus veſtris poſſitis deſtinata concelebrent, confirmantes & conſentientes iis quæ pro orthodoxa fide & deſtructione hæreticorum veſtris nuper exorta à nobis ſtatuta ſunt. Mart. 1. Ep. ad Amand. Traject. ext. poſt Act. Concil. Later. ſub Mart.

So that every Biſhop who ſubſcribes to the Decrees of a Council, approves

approves and confirms it in conſenting to it by his hand-writing; which perfectly agrees with what St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* wrote to the Biſhop of *Meteline*, whom ſome would have made believe, that the Pope protected *Neſtorius*: *Believe it not*, ſaid he to him, *for I aſſure you, that the Pope hath written to us conform to the Deciſions of the Council of* Epheſus, *that he hath with us confirmed all the Acts; and that he agrees with us in one and the ſame Judgment.* This it is then which the Popes themſelves call confirming a Council: and it is never to be found in the Ancient Church, that Councils, by their Synodal Letters directed to the Popes, have demanded any other Confirmation of their Decrees relating to the Faith, than their Conſent and Approbation, which they were obliged to give. For, in fine, if the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaks by a Council lawfully called, when they pronounce concerning a matter of Faith, and that they ſay, *Viſum eſt ſpiritui ſancto & nobis*;

Ne credat hoc ſanctitas tua: ſcripſit enim conſona ſanctæ Synodo omnia; nobiſcum confirmavit & nobiſcum ſimul. Cyril. Alex. Epiſt. ad Acacium Meliten. Epiſc.

the Pope muſt needs approve and obey what the Holy Ghoſt hath ſaid. And if the Holy Ghoſt ſpeak not by the Council until the Popes have given their Approbation to it, then might they alone, by refuſing that, have been the cauſe, that the Holy Ghoſt, who is to teach us all Truth, might never have inſtructed us, and that *Arianiſm*, and all other Hereſies, had only been tolerable Opinions; which, in my Judgment, no Man dares to ſay.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

That Ancient Councils have examined the Judgments of Popes, that they might pronounce the last and definitive Sentence upon them.

THough Councils have always had a great Respect for the Popes, and that in great Controversies which have given occasion for calling them, for giving a supreme Decision in controverted Points, they have many times pronounced Sentences conform to those which the Popes had already past against one of the two Parties; nevertheless they have examined them, to know whether they were just or not: which makes it apparent, that they believed that they had a Superiority over the Pope, altogether like to that which superiour Judicatures have over inferiour. Take two famous Instances of this, which puts the Truth thereof beyond all doubt.

Flavian, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, in his particular Council, condemned the pernicious Doctrine of *Eutyches*, who acknowledged but one Nature in Jesus Christ; and the great Pope St. *Leo*, by his Judgment, confirmed that of the Patriarch, as appears by the Letters which he wrote unto him, wherein he wonderfully well asserts the Catholick Belief concerning the Distinction of two Natures, the divine and humane, in one only person, in *Jesus Christ*, against the Error of that Arch-Heretick who confounded them. *Dioscorus*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, who openly declared himself the Protector of *Eutyches*, undertook his Business, and prevailed so far by favour of *Chrysaphius*, who could do any thing with his Master the Emperour *Theodosius* the younger, that this Prince called the second Council of *Ephesus*, there to examine what had been determined at *Constantinople* and *Rome* against *Eutyches*.

St.

St. *Leo*, who approv'd not this Proceeding that look'd like cabaling, at firſt withſtood it, but conſented thereunto at length for the ſake of Peace, hoping that all things would be carried in that Council according to Canonical Forms, and that then the definitive Judgment that would be pronounced there, would calm the Troubles of the Church. Whereupon, he ſent his Legates thither with Letters to the Patriarch *Flavian* and to the Council, wherein having declared what he had done againſt the new Hereſie of *Eutyches*, he adds, that however, ſeeing all care is to be taken to reclaim thoſe who were gone aſtray, and that the Emperour had appointed a Council to be held for that Effect, *to the end that Error might entirely be aboliſhed by a more ample Judgment*, he ſends a Biſhop, a Prieſt, and a Deacon, with an Apoſtolical Notary, to aſſiſt thereat on his Name, and there to ſettle, by common Advice, what was fit for the Service of God; that is to ſay,

Quia etiam talium non eſt negligenda curatio, & piè ac religioſè chriſtianiſſimus imperator haberi voluit Epiſcopale concilium, ut pluriori Judicio omnis poſſit error aboleri, fratres noſtros, &c. qui vice meâ Sanctæ conventui veſtræ fraternitatis interſint, & communi vobiſcum ſententia quæ domino ſunt placitura conſtituant, hoc eſt, ut primitus peſtifero errore damnato, &c.

Si tamen sensus hereticos --- plenè aperteq; propria voce & subscriptione damnaverit. St. *Leo* Ep. 15. ad Ephes. Syn.

say, that after so pernicious an Error should be condemned, they would take into consideration the re-establishment of the Author of it, always provided that he condemned his Heresie by Word and Writing.

This great Pope openly declares, That that Opinion of *Eutyches* is Heresie. Nay, he writes to *Flavian*, that it is so manifest, that there was no necessity to assemble a Council for condemning it; and nevertheless, he is content that one be held, *to the end that Error may be entirely abolished by a more ample Judgment.*

Ep. 16. ad Flav.

But more still. For that second Council of *Ephesus*, by the Power of *Chrysaphius* and Violence of *Dioscorus*, being become that infamous Den of Thieves where all Order was over-turned, and *Eutyches* absolved; this holy Pope who would have that Heresie thundred by a definitive Sentence, made continual Instances to the Emperour *Marcian* and the Empress *Pulcheria*, after

after the Death of *Theodoſius*, for calling of a new Council, which was held at *Chalcedon*; where, after Examination of the Doctrine of *Eutyches*, and the Letters of St. *Leo*, they confirmed by their Sovereign Authority, and by a ſupreme Judgment, what the holy Pope had pronounced againſt that Hereſie.

And in that he gloried, when writing to *Theodoret* who had condemned in that Council the Hereſie of *Neſtorius* whereof he was ſuſpected, and that of *Eutyches*, after he had congratulated with him in a moſt obliging manner, he ſubjoyns upon his account theſe lovely Words: *We glory in the Lord, who hath not permitted that our Brethren ſhould do any thing to our Diſadvantage; but on the contrary, hath confirmed by the Aſſent of the whole Council what had been before defined by our Miniſtery, to ſhew that that Judgment has truly proceeded from him; which being firſt rendered by the chief of all Sees, hath been received by the Judgment of the whole Church.*

Gloriamur in Domino, — qui nullum nos in noſtris fratribus detrimentum ſuſtinere permiſit, ſed quæ noſtro primùm miniſterio definiebat univerſo fraternitatis firmavit aſſenſu, ut verè à ſe prodiiſſe oſtenderet, quod primùm à primâ omnium ſede formatum, totius orbis Judicium recepiſſet. St. *Leo* Ep. 63. ad Theodor.

Is

Is not that to ſay, that to know whether the Deciſions of the Pope proceed from God or not, they muſt be received by the whole Church, and that by conſequent the Council which repreſents it, and which gives them their full force by its ſupreme Authority, is above the Pope?

This appears ſtill more clearly by one other Inſtance, where it is to be ſeen, that a General Council having examined a Judgment ſolemnly rendered by the Pope, reſcinds it, and paſſes a contrary Sentence. It is that which the fifth Council pronounced againſt the *three Chapters*, and againſt the Conſtitution of Pope *Virgilius*, whereby he had approved them, forbidding all men whoſoever to condemn them. I have already ſpoken of that Action which ſtandeth not in need of any long diſcourſe to ſet it off in its full Force and Vigour.

In this Council the Doctrine of the Three Chapters, and the Conſtitution of the Pope who approves them,

them, are examined. He is prayed to preſide in that Aſſembly, and in the Examination that is made there of theſe Writings. He refuſes, though he was then at *Conſtantinople* where the Council was held, and with all his might ſtill maintains thoſe three Chapters; and nevertheleſs they are condemned, and are to this day reckoned to have been very lawfully and juſtly condemned: nay, he was afterwards neceſſitated to ſubmit to that Decree, as I have already ſaid upon the Credit of very good Vouchers; and if yet he did not ſubmit to it, it is ſtill certain, that the Council examined his Judgment, and reſcinded it. After that, can it be doubted, but that the ancient Church believed that a Council is ſuperiour to the Pope?

Let's reflect a little upon what I ſaid of the ſixth Council, which condemned the Hereſie of the *Monothelites*. In it was examined what the Pope St. *Martin* had decided concerning that Subject in his Coun-

Council of the Biſhops of *Italy* celebrated at *Rome*, and what Pope *Honorius* had before him declared, in relation to the ſame Controverſie, in his Epiſtles to *Sergius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, one of the chief Authors of that Hereſie. The Judgment of St. *Martin* was approved in that Council; and that of *Honorius* ſo ſeverely cenſured, that the Pope was there anathematiſed. Whether theſe Letters were well or ill underſtood, it makes nothing to our preſent purpoſe. The Council paſſes Judgment upon him, and no body ever objected againſt it in Antiquity. This is ſufficient to conclude invincibly, that the Council is ſuperiour to the Pope.

But is there any thing more convincing and deciſive for fixing of this Truth, than what was done in the caſe of the *Donatiſts*, who by their Schiſm troubled all the Church of *Africa*? They applied themſelves to the Emperour *Conſtantine* who was then in *Gallia*, and

Optat. Milevit. l. 1. contr. Parmen. Euſeb. Eccleſ. hiſt. l. 10. c. 5.

and deſired of him Judges choſen from among the Biſhops of the *Gallican* Church, againſt *Cecilian* Biſhop of *Carthage*, becauſe they would ſhun the Judgment of the Pope, whom they diſtruſted. The Emperour nevertheleſs having proteſted that it belonged not to him to meddle in Eccleſiaſtical matters, ſent them back to the Pope, to whom, as Head of the Church, it belongs to judge of greater Cauſes. Pope *Miltiades* took for Aſſeſſors in this Judgment, fifteen Biſhops of *Italy*, to whom he joyned three famous Biſhops of the *Gallican* Church, *Maternus* of *Cologne*, *Rheticius* of *Autun*, and *Marinus* of *Arles*, whom the Emperour had ſent him to be of the number of the Judges, that the *Donatiſts* might not have cauſe to ſay, that every thing had been refuſed them. That Cauſe was ſolemnly judged in that Council of *Rome*. *Donatus*, Head of the Schiſmaticks, appeared there with ten Biſhops of his Party, and alledged all that he had to ſay againſt

Auguſt. Ep. 162. ad Gelor. & Eleuſ Ep. 165. ad Generoſ. 166. ad Donatiſt. 167. & alib. ſæpe.

gainſt *Cecilian*, who appeared alſo, accompanied with ten other *African* Biſhops, and defended his Cauſe and that of the Church, ſo well againſt the Authors of that Schiſm, that they were condemned.

They were very willing to be judged by this Council, imagining, as St. *Auſtin* obſerves, that either they might gain their Cauſe by Artifices and Calumnies, or that if they loſt it, yet they might ſtill maintain their Party, by complaining loudly in all places, that the Pope and his Biſhops, who were prejudiced againſt them, had judged partially. The truth is, they did ſo, and preſſed the Emperor ſo hard to give them new Judges, and in greater number, that that good Prince, overcome by their extream Importunity, which he called extream Fury, granted their deſire: and ſeeing he paſſionately deſired to reſtore Peace to the Church, and utterly to aboliſh ſo fatal a Schiſm, by a ſupreme Sentence that might for ever put an end

Ep. 162.

O rabida furoris audacia! Opt. loc. cit.

end to that great Conteſt, he called the great Council of *Arles*, which St. *Auſtin* calls a full and univerſal Council, becauſe as *Euſebius* aſſures us, and after him that holy Doctor, there was there an infinite number of Biſhops of all the Provinces of the Empire, and eſpecially of the *Gauls*.

Apud Arelatum eandem cauſam diligentius examinandam terminandamque curaſſe. Auguſt. Ep. 162. Euſeb. l. 10. c. 5. Augnſt. Ep. 167. ad Feſt.

Ex omnibus mundi partibus, & præcipue Gallicanis. Concil. Arelat. 11.

The Legates of Pope *Sylveſter*, with the eighteen Biſhops who had been at the Council of *Rome* were preſent there. The Cauſe of the *Donatiſts* was examined there afreſh, with the Judgment which Pope *Melchiades*, the Predeceſſor of St. *Sylveſter*, had given againſt them; and they were again condemned by a definitive Sentence, and without appeal, in regard of the Eccleſiaſtical Tribunal: for the Appeal which theſe Schiſmaticks, who obſerved no meaſures, brought to the Tribunal of *Conſtantine*, was moſt unjuſt, as was frankly acknowledged by that Emperour, who ſaid that if he at length took cognizance of that Cauſe, to ſtop the

Auguſt. Ep. 162.

mouth of theſe Hereticks, and arreſt the courſe of their Fury, he humbly begg'd pardon of the Biſhops, whoſe Authority, in what concerns the ſpiritual, he ſhould invade.

Whereupon, St. *Auſtin* anſwering the Comp'aints that the *Donatiſts* of his time always made of Pope *Melchiades*, as their Anceſtors had done, jeered them pleaſantly, ſaying, that they acted like bad Lawyers, who having loſt their Cauſe blame their Judges, and complain to all men, that they have been unjuſtly condemned, when they have even been convicted by the moſt manifeſt diſcovery of the Truth. Then, to confound them, he adds theſe great Words, which plainly decides the Queſtion that we examine, and to which nothing can be replied: *Suppoſe that the Judges who condemned your Anceſtors at* Rome *had judged amiſs, was not there ſtill the full Council, where that Cauſe might be again examined with the ſame Judges who*

Quæ vox eſt omnium malorum litigatorum, cum fuerint etiam manifeſtiſſimâ veritate ſuperati. Ibid.

Ecce putemus illos Epiſcopos qui Romæ judicarunt non bonos Judices fuiſſe: reſtabat adhuc plenarium Eccleſiæ Univerſalis concilium, ubi etiam cum ipſis judicibus cauſa poſſet agitari, ut ſi male judicaſſe convicti eſſent, eorum ſententia ſolveretur. Ibid.

who had already judged it; that if it had been found that their Judgment was not juſt, their Sentence might have been reſcinded?

I freely confeſs, that I cannot ſee how it can be better made out that the Pope's Tribunal is ſubject to that of a full and general Council, which may confirm or reſcind a Sentence paſt at *Rome*, as a ſupreme Court can confirm or reſcind the Judgment of an inferiour. So when the ſame St. *Auſtin* ſays in another place, ſpeaking of the *Pelagians*, *We have Reſcripts come from* Rome, *the Cauſe is ended*; that's to be underſtood, that it is ended at *Rome*, whither theſe Hereticks after they had been condemned in the Councils of *Africa*, appealed to the Pope, and thought to have gained their Cauſe by their Artifice which had once ſucceeded with them. It was not judged ſupremely but in the Council of *Epheſus*. We muſt

Jam enim de hac cauſâ duo concilia miſſa ſunt ad ſedem Apoſtolicam; inde etiam reſcripta venerunt; cauſa finita eſt. Auguſt. Serm. 2. de Verb. Dom. c. 10.

then of necessity conclude, that it cannot more clearly be seen than in those Instances which I have now alledged of universal Councils which have judged the Sentences of Popes, That it was believed in the ancient Church, before Saint *Austin*, and in his Time, and after him, without the least doubting, that a general Council is above the Pope. And that's the thing I was to prove.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIX.

That the ancient Popes have always acknowledged, and proteſted, that they were ſubject to Councils.

BUT that I may farther prove it upon as ſolid a ground, and which ought to be the more plauſible, and leſs to be rejected, becauſe I ſhall produce, as Evidences for this Truth, thoſe who are moſt concerned in the Affair: I need ſay no more, but that the ancient Popes, whom of late, in ſpight of themſelves, they would have elevated above Councils, do themſelves proteſt, that they are ſubject unto them, and that they ought to obey them in matters belonging to Faith, the Regulation of Manners, the univerſal Good and general Diſcipline of the Church.

Is there any thing clearer and more ſincere as to that Subject, than the Teſtimony of Pope *Syricius*, Succeſſor to *Damaſus*? The Em-

perours *Theodoſius* and *Valentinian* the younger, had called a great Council of the Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops at *Capoua*, for quenching the Schiſm of *Antioch*, which after the Death of *Meletius* and *Paulinus* ſtill continued by the Election that the two different Parties of that Church made of *Flavian* to ſucceed to *Meletius*, and of *Evagrius* Succeſſor to *Paulinus*. Seeing *Flavian* appeared not, the Council delegated *Theophilus* of *Alexandria* to judge and determine that great difference with conſent of the Biſhops of *Egypt*; and at the ſame time, ſince the Council was informed againſt a Biſhop of *Macedonia* called *Bonoſus* accuſed of Hereſie and Impiety againſt the holy Virgin, who durſt not appear; the Council committed the Tryal of the Cauſe to *Anyſius* of *Theſſalonica*, that he might determine it in a Synod which he ſhould hold with the Biſhops of *Macedonia* and *Illyrium*.

Ann. 390.

Ambroſ. Epiſt. ad Theoph. Alexand. Epiſt. Syricii ad Anyſ. Theſſalon.

Theſe, whether to diſcharge themſelves of the Judgment which they

they well foreſaw they muſt of neceſſity paſs againſt one of their Brethren, or out of the Veneration that they had for the Holy See, referred that Judgment to Pope *Syricius*. But he wrote back to them, that if the Council had determined nothing about the Cauſe of *Bonoſus*, he would have pronounced a juſt Judgment concerning what they had written to him of that Biſhop; but that ſince the Council had commiſſionated them to take Cogniſance of that Cauſe by a deciſive Judgment with the Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, he frankly confeſſed, that he had no Power to judge of it. *It is you*, ſaid he, *who are to ſupply the place of the Council in that Judgment, and who received the Power to determine it, to whom it belongs to pronounce about that Affair, ſeeing you repreſent the Council which hath transferred its Authority upon you, and not to me who have it not.* There is a Pope of the fourth Age, who ingenuouſly confeſſes, That the Delegates of the Council, much more

Cum hujuſmodi fuerit Concilii Capuenſis Judicium, ut ſuiſmi Bonoſo atque ejus accuſatoribus Judices tribuerentur, advertimus quod nobis Judicandi forma competere non poſſit. Nam ſi integra eſſet hodie ſynodus reſtè de iis quæ comprehendit ſcriptorum veſtrorum ſeries decerneremus. Veſtrum eſt igitur qui hoc receptiſtis Judicium, ſententiam ferre de omnibus —— vicem enim Synodi recepiſtis quos ad examinandum Synodus elegit. —— Primum eſt ut ii judicent quibus judicandi facultas eſt data: vos enim totidem ut ſcripſimus Synodi vice decernitis; nos quaſi ex Synodi authoritate judicare non convenit.

Epiſt. Syricii ad Anyſ. Theſ. in collect. Roman. bipertit. veter. monument. Romæ, 1662.

the Council it self, have greater Power than he hath, and who by consequent acknowledges that the Authority of Councils is above that of Popes.

Innocent I. who three Years after *Syricius* was Pope, and who had observed his Conduct in relation to the Council of *Capoue*, walked also according to the Tradition of the *Roman* Church, and the Example of his Predecessors, who never thought that their Power was equal, and far less superiour to that of a Council. For in the great Persecution that *Theophilus*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, rais'd against St. *John Chrysostom*, who was condemned and deposed, in a Synod of Bishops of the Faction of *Theophilus*, and Enemies to that Saint; seeing the Pope and Western Bishops had been written to on both sides, that holy Bishop did indeed rescind that Judgment past contrary to all the Forms and Rules of Councils by incompetent Judges, against an Absent who had judicially appeal-

ed

Chrys. Ep. ad Innoc. 1.
Ep. Inn. ad Jo. Chrys. apud Sozom. l. 8. c. 26.
Innoc. Epist. ad cleric. Constant.
Pallad. dial. de vit. Chrysost. c. 2.

Theophili Judicium cassum & irritum esse decrevit, dicens oportere & constare alium irreprehensibilem Synodum occidentalium sacerdotum cedentibus amicis primum, deinde inimicis; neutrarum quippe partium ut plurimum vellum esse Judicium.
Pallad. loc. cit.

ed to a lawful Council; but as to the Substance of the Affair, and the Accusation in hand, he would never meddle in it. He thought, that considering the Importance of the Affair, wherein the Honour and Dignity of a Patriarch, whose Faith had always been so pure, and his Learning and eminent Sanctity in so high a Veneration over all the Church, was struck at, nothing but an impartial Council, wherein the Friends and Enemies of neither side should be present, could pronounce a definitive Sentence concerning the matter.

Quodnam remedium hisce rebus afferemus? necessaria erit Synodalis cognitio.

This he wrote to both Parties; and in the Letters which he directs to St. Chrysostom, to his Bishops and Clergy of *Constantinople*, he says positively, that that Council, even the same to which that holy Patriarch had appealed, was absolutely necessary for determining that great Affair by a supreme Sentence; that there was no other Remedy but that, for the Evils that afflicted them; that he could not help them

Ea sola est quæ hujusmodi procellarum impetus retardare potest. Innoc.

Cum opem ipse ferre non posset. Pallad.

Multum deliberemus quonam modo Synodus Oecumenica congregari poſſit, per quam &c. Expedemus igitur & vallo patientiæ communiti, &c.
Inn. ad Cler. Conſtant.

them otherwiſe; that an Oecumenical Council alone could reſtore Peace to the Eaſtern Church, and calm ſo furious a Tempeſt: and that in the mean time it behoved them to arm themſelves with Patience, and have recourſe only to God, expecting till that Council ſhould be called, wherein he laboured inceſſantly, ſearching out the Meaſures that might be taken for having it called. Could that Pope expreſs himſelf in clearer terms, that a general Council hath an higher power, and of larger Extent than his own, and that by conſequent it is above him?

However, if I miſtake not, there is ſomewhat that ſtrikes higher in what *Innocent* III. one of his Succeſſors, no leſs zealous than he was for the Grandeur and Rights of the Holy See, wrote to *Philip Auguſt.* This Prince, who had a great deſire to have the Marriage which he had contracted with the Queen *Ingerburge* diſſolved, inſtantly preſſed the Pope to declare it null, that

ſo

ſo he might be free to marry another. That wiſe Pope writing back to the King, proteſts before God, that if he could in Conſcience grant what he demanded, he would do it with all his Heart; but, that tho he would ſtand by that which the Queen had anſwered Cardinal *Robert Cortzeon*, in favour of the diſſolution of that Marriage, who had interrogated her judicially, yet he could not of himſelf determine any thing about ſo important an Affair as that; and that, *If he offered to do it without a Council, beſides offending of God, and the Diſgrace that he ſhould draw upon himſelf in the World, he might perhaps be in danger of being depoſed, and of loſing his Pontifical Dignity.* There was a Pope, and one of the moſt learned that ever ſat in St. *Peter*'s Chair, who twice, and in few Words, confeſſes with much Sincerity, that the Council is above him: once, by ſaying, that he could determine nothing in that Affair propoſed to him, without the Definition of a Council; and then, if

Innoc. III. in l. 3. Regeſt. 15. Ep. 104. ad Philip. Reg. Franc. *Non auderemus in hujuſmodi caſu de noſtro ſenſu pro re aliquid definire.*

Si ſuper hoc abſque deliberatione Concilii determinare aliquod tentaremus, præter divinam offenſam & mundanam infamiam quam ex eo poſſumus incurrere, forſan ordinis & officii noſtri periculum immineret.

if he offered to do so, that he should run a hazard of being deposed from the Popedom. By whom? Without doubt by a Power that was superiour to his; which, as it is evident, could be none other upon Earth but that of a Council.

Pope *Agapetus*, long before, said the same upon an occasion, where the Question however was not about a matter of so great Importance as this, and of which, it is fit, I should give my Reader an Account in few words. In one of the Councils which Pope *Symmachus* held at *Rome*, there was a prohibition made, That no Pope, for ever, should alienate the Goods of the Church, and especially of the Church of *Rome*, which at that time were not Cities and Provinces, as they were after the Donations of the Kings of *France*, but some Lands and Farms which it held of the Bounty of Believers, besides the Oblations which in those days made up the greatest part of it. I give you here the most considerable

derable terms of the Decree, which prohibits that Alienation. *We ordain in the Preſence of God, by this Decree, that from this preſent day, ſo long as the Doctrine of the Faith continues in the World, by the Diſpoſition of divine Providence, that it be never lawful for any Pope to alienate any farm, great or ſmall, nor to transfer the ſame by way of Exchange to any whoſoever, under pretext and excuſe of any neceſſity that may happen.*

Now ſeeing about thirty ſix years after there was a Permiſſion deſired of Pope St. *Agapetus* to alienate ſome of theſe Lands, under a very ſpecious pretext of relieving the poor, he made Anſwer, that the venerable Conſtitutions of his Predeceſſors that had prohibited ſuch kinds of Alienations, tied him from granting it; that he thought they would not take it ill that he did nothing contrary to thoſe Decrees, whatever the occaſion might be, for any Reſpect in the World. *Nor would I have you think*, adds he in his

Ann. 500.

Majuſculo cum Dei conſideratione decreto ſanximus, ut nulli Apoſtolicæ ſedis præſuli à præſenti die, donec, diſponente domino Catholicæ Fidei manſerit doctrina ſalutaris, liceat prædium ruſticum, quantacunque fuerit magnitudinis, vel exiguitatis, ſub perpetuâ alienatione vel commutatione, ad cujuſlibet jura transferre; nec cujuſquam excuſentur neceſſitatis obtentu.

Concil. Rom. ſub Symmach. de bon. Eccleſ. non alien. c. 4.

Nec tenacitatis studio, aut secularis utilitatis causâ hoc facere vos credatis, sed divini considerationi Judicii necesse nobis est, quicquid sancta synodalis decrevit authoritas, inviolabiliter custodire.

his Epistles to *Cæsarius* Bishop of *Arles*, *that I do so out of Covetousness or any temporal Interest. But, considering the strict Account that I must give at the last Judgment, I think my self obliged to observe inviolably what the holy Council hath enjoyned us.* Yet, all this while, this was but a National Council of *Italy* which had made that Decree, to which Pope *Agapetus* says that he was obliged to submit: upon stronger Reason, without doubt, would he have said the same, if it had been a Decree of an Oecumenical Council.

There are a great many Popes who have expressed themselves as plainly as these, that they were subject to a Council. I'll mention no more but one, who delivers his Mind upon that Subject in such a manner, as no man is able to reply to. And that is the famous *Gerbert*, *Silvester* II. who filled three Sees successively of *Reims*, *Ravenna*, and lastly of *Rome*, and was a most Learned Pope, whom I have characterized

racterized in ſome of my Hiſtories. For that purpoſe, he makes uſe of this paſſage in the Goſpel, where our Saviour ſays to his Diſciples, That if your Brother offend you, reprove him privately, and then in preſence of two or three Witneſſes; and if he amend not, tell the Church of him; and if he obey not the Church, let him be as a Publican and as a Heathen. The famous and learned *Toſtatus* Biſhop of *Avila*, employs that Paſſage to prove that the ſupreme and higheſt Tribunal of the Church is that of a Council, to which *Jeſus Chriſt* referred all his Diſciples, and by conſequent St. *Peter*, who is therefore ſubject to it as to his lawful Judge, from whom he is to expect the Juſtice that he may demand againſt his Brother. Pope *Silveſter* makes uſe of it in another manner, but for the ſame end: for he pretends, what is true, that theſe Words ſpoken to St. *Peter* by our Saviour in relation to his Brethren, were alſo ſpoken to the ſame Brethren in regard

Defenſor. p. c. c. 29.

of

St. *Peter*, as well as of the reſt. Whereupon that Pope writing to *Seguinus* Archbiſhop of *Sens*, hath made no difficulty to expreſs himſelf in theſe very pithy and ſignificant Words: *I ſay it boldly, that if even the Biſhop of* Rome *offend againſt you, and that being often admoniſhed he obey not the Church, that Biſhop of* Rome, *I ſay, ought to be look'd upon by the Command of God himſelf, as a Publican and as a Heathen.* Could that Pope have expreſſed himſelf more clearly, That he thought the Popes, for all they are Heads of the Church, are ſtill ſubject to a Council that repreſents it.

Conſtanter dico, quod ſi ipſe Romanus Epiſcopus in fratrem peccaverit, ſæpiuſque admonitus Eccleſiam non audierit, hic, inquam, Romanus Epiſcopus præcepto Dei eſt habendus ſicut Ethnicus & Publicanus. Sylveſt. 2. Epiſt. ad Seguin. Senon.

CHAP.

CHAP. XX.

That the ancient Popes have believed, That they were ſubject to the Canons.

IT is another invincible Argument that Antiquity hath always been in that Belief, that the ancient Popes have alwa ys proteſted in their true Epiſtles, for I ſpeak not of thoſe which are ſuppoſititious, that they were obliged, in the Exerciſe of their Power, and in the Government of the Church, to ſquare their Conduct according to the Canons and holy Decrees of Councils, againſt which they could undertake nothing.

Is there any thing plainer as to that point, than what is to be ſeen in the Epiſtle of Pope *Gelaſius* to the Biſhops of *Dordany*, *That no man ought more exactly to execute what is ordained by the Univerſal Council, than the Biſhop of the chief See?* In that of *Celeſtin* I. to the Biſhops of *Illyrium*; *The Regulation of Councils muſt*

Uniuſcujuſq; Synodi conſtitutum, quod univerſalis Eccleſia probávit aſſenſu, non aliquam magis exiqui ſedem pra cæteris oportere quam primam.

Dominentur nobis regulæ, non regulis dominemur. Simus subjecti canonibus, dum canonum præcepta servamus.

be our Rules and have dominion over us, and not that we ſhould raiſe our ſelves above theſe holy Rules, that we may diſpoſe of them at our Pleaſure: let us ſubmit our ſelves to the Canons by obſerving what they enjoyn. In what

Nimis hæc improba, nimis ſunt prava quæ ſacratiſſimis canonibus inveniantur eſſe contraria.

St. Leo wrote to *Anatolius*: *Whatſoever is contrary to the moſt holy Canons is too wicked and d praved to be tolerated.* In the Letter of *Simplicius*

Per univerſum mundum indiſſolubili obſervationi retinetur, quod à ſacerdotum univerſitate iſt conſtitutum.

to the Patriarch *Acacius*: *What is eſtabliſhed by an Univerſal Council is retained throughout the whole World by an inviolable Obſervation.* In that of Pope St. *Martin* to *John* Biſhop of *Philadelphia*: *We are the Defenders and Guardians of the holy Canons,*

Defenſores divinorum canonum & cuſtodes ſumus, non Prævaricatores; quandoquidem Prævaricatoribus conjuncta ſunt retributiones.

and not the Prevaricators of them, for we know, that great Correction is reſerved for thoſe that betray them.

St. *Gregory* the Great ſpeaks with as much force as theſe, in an hundred places of his Epiſtles; as when he ſays in the thirty ſeventh of his

Abſit hoc à me, ut ſtatuta majorum in qualibet Eccleſiâ infringam.

firſt Book: *Far be it from me, that I ſhould infringe the Statutes of our Predeceſſors in any Church whatſoever:* And writing to *John*, Patriarch of

Con-

Conſtantinople: He that preſumes to looſe thoſe whom General Councils have bound, or to bind thoſe whom they have looſed, deſtroys himſelf and not the Councils. He was ſo well perſuaded of his Duty, that obliged him to obſerve the Canons, that he even thought, that that Obligation extended to matters which he found to be eſtabliſhed by an ancient Cuſtom and Tradition in his Church.

Dum concilia univerſali ſunt conſenſu conſtituta, ſe & non illa deſtruit, quiſquis præſumsit aut ſolvere quos ligant, aut ligare quos ſolvunt.

For, the Empreſs *Conſtantina* having entreated him to ſend her either the Head or ſome other conſiderable part of the Body of St. *Paul*, to be put in a Church which ſhe had built to the Memory of that great Apoſtle; that holy Pope wrote back to her, That he could have paſſionately deſired, that her *Serenity* had commanded him in any thing wherein he could have ſerved and obeyed her; but as to what ſhe ordered him to do, he neither could nor durſt do it, becauſe, ſaid he, it is at *Rome*, nay in all the Weſt, looked upon as unſupportable, and a great Sacriledge, to touch the Bodies

Illa præcipiat, quæ facere nec poſſum, nec audeo, &c.

In Romanis vel totius occidentis partibus intolerabile eſt atque ſacrilegium, ſi ſanctorum corpora tangere quiſquam ſortaſſe voluerit: quod ſi præſumpſerit, certum eſt quia hæc temeritas impunita nullo modo remanebit. lib. 3. Indic. 12. Ep. 30. ad Conſtant. Auguſtam.

dies of the Saints; and if any one have the boldneſs to attempt it, his raſhneſs will never paſs unpuniſhed.

Perhaps if at *Rome* they had made any Reflexion on this Epiſtle, when it was reſolved there to have an Arm of the Body of St. *Francis Xavier*, the Apoſtle of the *Indies*, which was then to be ſeen at *Goa* in his ſtately Monument above threeſcore years after his Death, as freſh and ruddy as when he was alive, they would not have given Orders to have it cut off; and that if he who obeyed that Command, had read that Letter, he would have anſwered with as much reſpect as St. *Gregory* did, *Nec poſſum, nec audio.* For beſides, that that Arm which is now to be ſeen at *Rome* is all withered, and that ſince that time the holy Body is not ſo freſh as it was before; they who were employed in that Office, and had the boldneſs to lay hands upon that ſacred Body, died within the Year. And I have learned of a very honeſt Gentleman of Quality who lately returned from the

the *Indies*, that thoſe of *Goa* attribute to that Action all the Evils they have been afflicted with ſince that time, and all the Loſſes which the *Portugueſe* have ſuſtained in the *Eaſt-Indies*.

Thus the holieſt Popes, when they were deſired any thing to the prejudice of the Canons, or even of the ancient Cuſtoms, which paſs for ſo many Laws, have not ſcrupuled to confeſs, that their power extended not ſo far. For beſides the Inſtances that I have juſt now alledged, *John* VIII. ſpeaks in the ſame manner to one of the Kings of *France*: *We could not act againſt the Decrees of our Predeceſſors, leſt it ſhould ſeem that we tranſgreſs the Bounds ſet to us by our Fathers.* And *Eugenius* III. to the Biſhops of *Germany*; *We can grant no Demand againſt God, and againſt the Decrees of the ſacred Canons.* The meaning of that is, that as the Pope can grant nothing againſt the Service of God, becauſe he is inferiour to God, ſo neither can he grant any thing againſt the Canons of Oecu-

Ne in aliquo patrum terminos præterire videamur, contra majorum ſtatuta agere nequivimus. Joan. VIII. Epiſt. ad Carol. Reg.

Contra Deum & ſacrorum canonum ſanctiones nulli omnino petitioni poſſumus præbere conſenſum.

menical Councils, becauſe he is under them.

In fine, that we may not alledge an infinite number of other Teſtimonies, which may be ſeen in the true Epiſtles of the Popes, ſince *Syricius*, I ſhall conclude with that of *Silveſter* II. to the Archbiſhop of *Sens*, wherein he ſays, *This is the Law according to which the Catholick Church is to be governed, The Goſpel, the Writings of the Apoſtles and Prophets, the Canons which the Spirit of God hath made, and which are conſecrated by the Veneration of all the World, and the Decrees of the Apoſtolick See which are not contrary to theſe Canons.* And that is the very ſame that was defined in the Council of *Florence* after long debate betwixt the *Latins* and *Greeks*, concerning the primacy and power of the Pope in the Univerſal Church.

Sit lex communis Eccleſiæ Catholicæ, Evangelium, Apoſtoli, Prophetæ, Canones ſpiritu Dei conditi, & totius mundi reverentia conſecrati, & decreta ſedis Apoſtolicæ eò his non diſcordantia.
Epiſt. ad Seguin. Arch. Senen.

Ex Art. Concilii Florent. è Seſſ. 25. Antiq. Edition. cum approb. Clement. VII.

It was agreed upon on both ſides, That the Pope, as Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, was Head of the Church, the Father and Teacher of all Believers, who had received from *Jeſus Chriſt*,

in the perſon of St. *Peter*, full power to govern the Church. The difficulty only reſted in expreſſing the manner how he might and ought to govern it. The *Latins* would have the Definition run thus, That he had above all others the priviledge and full power of governing the whole Church according to the Sayings and Sentences of the holy Fathers, *Juxta determinationem ſacræ Scripturæ, & dicta ſanctorum.* The Emperour *John Paleologue* and *Greek* Prelates, vigorouſly oppos'd that Clauſe, *& dicta ſanctorum.* *How*, ſaid he, *if any of the Holy Fathers, writing to the Pope, ſays to him what he thinks fit, for rendering him greater Reſpect and more Honour*; *ſhall the Pope take theſe Expreſſions of Complement and Civility for Priviledges that belong to him?* Beſides, in the draught of the Bull of Union of the two Churches, the Pope having only put his own name, *Eugenius Biſhop, Servant of the Servants of God*, as if he alone had made theſe Decrees: the Emperour and the

An ſquis, inquit, ſanctorum in Epiſtola honoret Papam, accipiet hoc pro Privilegio?

Greeks would by all means have that amended, and that there ſhould no mention be made of the Pope in it, unleſs the other Patriarchs were alſo named.

At length, after that theſe two conſiderable Clauſes had been well examin.d, the Union was made in the manner that the *Greeks* deſired it, to which the *Latins* agreed. Then the Bull was framed, which began thus; *Eugenius, Servant of the Servants of God*, &c. *Our dearly beloved Son* John Paleologue *illuſtrious Emperour of the* Romans, *thoſe who hold the place of our venerable Brethren the Patriarchs, and all the reſt who repreſent the Eaſtern Church conſenting to all the Decrees which are in this Bull*, &c. And then among other Articles it was defined, That *Jeſus Chriſt* hath given to the Pope in the perſon of St. *Peter*, full power to govern the Univerſal Church in the manner as is contained both in the Acts of Oecumenical Councils, and in the ſacred Canons, and not according to the falſe Tranſla-

Κατὰ τὸν τρόπον καὶ ἐν τοῖς οἰκουμενικοῖς, &c. *Juxta eum modum qui & in geſtis conciliorum, & in canonibus continetur.*

tion

tion, *Quemadmodum etiam & in gestis Conciliorum*, &c. as if it were said, that the Canons of Councils attribute also to the Pope, the power of governing the Universal Church. It is a quite contrary Sense to the Words of the Council, which says only, that the Pope hath received from *Jesus Christ* the power of governing the Church in the manner as is prescribed to him by the Canons, *Juxta eum modum qui & in gestis Conciliorum, & in Canonibus continetur*. Which comprehends all, because it is supposed, as it is very true, that the Canons of Oecumenical Councils are conform to holy Scripture, Tradition, and the true Sayings of the holy Fathers, from whom we derive our Tradition.

From those two Clauses of the Bull wherein both the Eastern and Western Churches, after they had well examined them, agreed, two things may be unquestionably concluded; the one, that the Pope can determine nothing in his Constitutions of infallible Authority, without

out the Consent of the Church; and the other, that the Exercise of his power which is not infinite and unlimited, ought to be moderated according to the Rules prescribed to him by the Canons of the Councils, to which all Believers are subject. What the Popes have over others, is the Care they ought to take to see them observed, not only by their Authority, but by their Example, which is of greater force and efficacy than their Ordinances; and if they themselves violate them acting arbitrarily as they please, without regard to the Canons which ought to be their measures, or suffer them to be violated by others without punishment, they become culpable before God, who hath made them not the Masters, but the Stewards of the Church, to act according to her Orders, and cause them to be obeyed. This the great St. *Leo* expressed admirably well in those rare words which he wrote to the Emperour *Martian*: *With the Assistance of Jesus Christ I must*

I muſt conſtantly continue my Service, in faithfully executing what I am commanded, becauſe he has truſted me with the Care and Diſpenſation of his Houſe; and I make my ſelf guilty of great Unfaithfulneſs, if by my Connivance, which God preſerve me from, I ſuffer the Rules and Canons to be violated, which have been made, by the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt, in the Council of Nice, *for the Government of the whole Church.*

Not but that the Pope, who ought to take the care of the general Good of the Church, may, on certain Occaſions, diſpenſe with the Canons: but in that thing it ſelf he is ſubject to the Canons, ſeeing he cannot diſpenſe with them as he pleaſes, and without any other reaſon ſave that of his Will, but only in Caſes preſcribed by the Canons, when urgent neceſſity, or manifeſt advantage, makes it appear according to the Canons that the Church intended not to oblige to them. Except in ſuch caſes, the ancient Popes ſay openly, that the Ca-

In quo opere auxiliante Chriſto, fideliter exequendo, neceſſe eſt me perſeverantem exhibere famulatum, quoniam diſpenſatio mihi credita eſt, & ad meum reatum tendit, ſi paternarum regulæ ſanctionum quæ in Synodo Niceni ad totius Eccleſiæ regimen ſpiritu Dei inſtruente ſunt conditæ, me, quod abſit, connivente, violentur. Ep. 54. ad Martian.

Dum tamen evidens utilitas vel neceſſitas id exposcunt. Greg. IX.

In talibus eadem utilitas & urgens neceſſitas ſecundum inſtituta canonum debet attendi. Innoc. III. Ep. ad Epiſc. Favent.

Ubi neceſſitas non eſt, inconvertibilis manent ſanctorum patrum inſtituta. Gelaſ.

Ubi neceſſitas non eſt nullo modo violentur ſanctorum patrum conſtituta.

St. Leo.

Canons and holy Decrees must be inviolably kept, and that they cannot dispense with them.

Whereupon St. *Bernard* writing to a Pope, told him with a great deal of holy liberty, that he forbids not to dispense, but to dissipate; that he knows very well that the Popes are the Stewards of the house of God, but for Edification and not for Destruction, and that the Steward ought to be faithful: when Necessity urges, Dispensation is excusable; and laudable when Advantage, not of a private person, but of the publick, requires it; and when neither appear in that which is desired, then what is granted is no more a faithful Dispensation, but a most cruel Dissipation. And this, as a learned Pope teacheth, renders both him that obtains that Dispensation, and him that grants it, criminal in the sight of God, unless he that granted it hath been, without his Fault, imposed upon by a false Information, as many times it happens. The power then of dispensing

Quid? Prohibes dispensare? non sed dissipare, &c. ubi necessitas urget excusabilis dispensatio est; ubi utilitas provocat, dispensatio laudabilis est, utilitas dico communis, non propria: nam cum horum nihil est, non plane fidelis dispensatio est, sed crudelissima dissipatio.
Bern. de cons. ad Eugen. l. 3. c. 6.

Hadrian. V. de dispens. Apostolic.

ſing exempts not Popes, according to the Ancients, from the Obedience which they owe to the Decrees of Councils; and when they do otherwiſe, and act in their Conſtitutions contrary to the Canons, that is not a lawful practice, but an abuſing of their power, and an abuſe that draws many others after it.

This that great Aſſembly of Cardinals and Prelates pick'd out of the beſt and ableſt men of the Court of *Rome*, which *Paul* III. called in the Year One thouſand five hundred and thirty eight, to ſearch for means of remedying the Troubles of the Church, repreſented to him with much Vigour and Reſpect, when they told him that the ſource of ſo many Diſorders was the Flattery of ſome new Doctors, who ſtrained their falſe Subtilties to make his Predeceſſors believe, that they were the abſolute Maſters of all in the Church, that they were above all Canons, and that there was no other Law for them, but their own Will and Pleaſure.

Principium malorum inde fuiſſe quod nonnulli pontifices coacervaverunt ſibi magiſtros & pruricntes auribus — ut eorum ſtudio & calliditate inveniretur ratio quâ liceret id quod liberet — pontificem eſſe dominum beneficiorum omnium — ita quod voluntas pontificis qualiſcunque ea fuerit, ſit regula quâ ejus operationes & actiones dirigantur, &c.

So

So that when it happened that ſome Popes manifeſtly abuſing their power, tranſgreſſed the limits ſet them by the Canons, Appeals were made to the next Oecumenical Council; as was done upon account
Ann. 1303. of the Bull of *Boniface* VIII. who pretended to a Sovereign power over all the Crowns upon Earth; as the Univerſity of *Paris*, in the Year 1491, appealed to a Pope better informed, and to the firſt general Council, concerning certain exactions and gatherings of Tenths, which were attempted againſt the Canons and Liberties of the *Gallican* Church; and as hath been done oftner than once in *Germany* upon the like Occaſions.

But ſeeing that Remedy is tedious, and that it may be abuſed by Appeals very ill brought, which, ſeeing they could not be judged in an whole Age, would render the pontifical Authority uſeleſs in the ſmalleſt matters, which *Pius* II. and *Julius* II. have moſt juſtly condemned; inſtead thereof, we have

in

in *France* an Appeal as of Abuſe, to the Parliament, which (repreſenting the King ſitting in his Chair of Juſtice, to whom, as protector of the Canons, it belongs to hinder any thing from being acted contrary to them) has Right to judge whether there be any matter, in the Bulls, Ordinances, and Eccleſiaſtical Sentences, which wound the Canons and our Liberties.

For in this chiefly conſiſt the Liberties of the Kingdom and *Gallican* Church, that no new thing can be commanded or enjoyned us contrary to the holy Decrees of the Councils received in *France*, and againſt the ancient Law, in the poſſeſſion whereof we have always maintained our ſelves, without ſubmitting to any other Laws, unleſs we our ſelves conſent to them; ſo that whatever derogates from theſe ancient Conſtitutions which are our inviolable Laws, is by Decree reſcinded. And this ſeems to be grounded upon that excellent Sentiment of *Innocent* III. a great Pope,

great

great Canoniſt, and great Lawyer, who ſpeaks like a Pope, when he ſays, *We will that all that is underta-ken and attempted againſt the holy Canons, be void and null; and we will it ſo much the rather, that the Autho-rity of the holy Church wherein we pre-ſide moves and inclines us to it.* As if by that he would tell us, that the Authority of the Church depends upon the Obſervation of her Ca-nons and Laws, and not on the Liberty that a Pope might take to violate them.

Quæ in derogationem ſanctorum canonum attentantur, tanto potius infringi volumus, & cartæ robore firmitatis; quantò auctoritas univerſalis Eccleſiæ, cui præſidemus, ad id nos provocat & inducit. Innoc. III. l. 1. Ep. ad Epiſc. Favent.

From all that I have ſaid in this Chapter, this truth of Fact reſults, That all Antiquity hath believed, that Popes being ſubject to the De-crees of Councils, and obliged to act and govern according to the Laws that are preſcribed to them by the Canons, Councils by con-ſequent are above the Popes.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

What General Councils have decided Rules to that Point.

SEeing that Question was not moved in the Ancient Church, when all were of the Opinion that I have now mentioned; Councils that decide nothing but upon occasion of Differences and Disputes which arise amongst Christians about some certain point of Doctrine, have given no definitive Sentence as to that particular, till it was begun to be questioned and disputed about. And this I think happened upon occasion of the Council of *Pisa*, which the Cardinals of both obediences, that is, of *Gregory* XII. and *Benet* XIII. with consent of almost all Kings and Sovereigns, called for extinguishing that Schism; which these two Competitors and pretended Popes entertained by their Collusion and Obstinacy, contrary to the

Concil. Pisan. t. 11. Edit. Paris Act. conc. ex codic. Gemmetic. t 6. Spirit. Monach. Dionys. l. 29. l. 1. & sequen. Niem. l. 23. Platina. Ciacconius.

expreſs Promiſe they had made of reſigning up their Pretenſions.

Ann. 1409. For ſeeing ſome who ſtood for *Gregory*, proteſted againſt the Council which, as they ſaid, had no Authority over the Popes, ſuch an unprecedented proteſtation in the Church being exploded, the famous Doctor *Peter Plaouſt*, one of the Deputies from the Univerſity of *Paris*, which at that time was in the Meridian of its Reputation, made a long and learned Speech in full Council, wherein he proved by many Reaſons, that the Univerſal Church, and, by conſequent a General Council which repreſents her, is above the Pope; adding, that that was the Judgment of the Univerſity of *Paris*, and of all the other Univerſities of *France*.

29 *May.*

No ſooner was he come down from the Pulpit, but that the Biſhop of *Novare* ſtept up, and read aloud a Writing, which declared, that an hundred and three Doctors and Licentiates of Divinity, deputed

puted by the Univerſities to that Council, being aſſembled by order of the Cardinals to conſult about that matter, were all unanimouſly of the Judgment of the Univerſity of *Paris*; and he affirmed, that beſides the Univerſities of *France*, it was alſo the Judgment of the famous Univerſity of *Bologna*, from which they had Letters, and of that of *Florence*, who had given it in writing under the Hands of ſixſcore Doctors. 1 *June.*

Six days after, the Proceſs that was brought againſt *Gregory* and *Benet* having been proved and made out in a judicial manner, the Council paſt a definitive Sentence, whereby it declares, *Pietro de la Luna* and *Angelo Corario* heretofore called Popes, *Benet* XIII. and *Gregory* XII. obſtinate Schiſmaticks and Hereticks, convicted of enormous Crimes, of Perjury, Impiety, and of Colluſion, to deceive Believers, and to keep up the Schiſm which ſo long had rent the Church, and as ſuch, depoſes them from the Pa-

pacy. This the Council did pursuant to the Decree, whereby it had before determined, that that Council represented the Church universal, and that it was the only supreme Judge upon Earth to whom the Judgment of that Cause belonged, though it was most certain, that one of these two Pretenders was the true Pope.

Afterwards they chose *Alexander* V. who was acknowledged by the Universal Church, except those two wretched Remains of *Obedience*, who held out still for the two Antipopes; and that Pope approved all the Decrees of the Council, even a moment before his Death, which was most holy and precious in the sight of God. I have heretofore proved, according to the Judgment of almost all the Churches of *Christendom*, of that of *Rome* in particular, nay and of the Universal Church represented by the Council of *Constance*, which was but a continuation of this, that it ought to be reckoned, without

out contradiction, lawful. But, ſince on the one hand, it hath pleaſed ſome Doctors beyond the *Alpes* to doubt of it, and that on the other, I decline all diſpute in this Treatiſe, I will only ſtick to matter of Fact, which cannot be conteſted; to wit, that this Counſil of *Piſa* hath been one of the greateſt Aſſemblies that was ever ſeen in the Church.

For there were in it five and twenty Cardinals, four Patriarchs, ſix and twenty Archbiſhops, an hundred fourſcore and two Biſhops either in perſon or by *Proxy*, two hundred fourſcore and ten Abbots, amongſt whom were all the Heads of the Orders, the Generals of the *Carthuſians* and of the four Mendicant Orders, the great Maſters of *Rhodes*, of the *Holy Sepulchre* and the Teutonick Knights, the Deputies of the Univerſities of *Paris*, *Tholouſe*, *Orleans*, *Angers*, *Montpellier*, *Bologna*, *Florence*, *Cracovia*, *Vienna*, *Prague*, *Cologne*, *Oxford* and *Cambridge*, and of ſome

others, and those of the Chapters of above an hundred Metropolitan and Cathedral Churches, above three hundred Doctors of Divinity and of the Law, the Ambassadors of the Kings of *France*, *England*, *Poland*, *Bohemia*, *Sicily*, and *Cyprus*, of the Dukes of *Burgundy* and *Lorrain*, *Brabant*, *Bavaria*, of the Marquess of *Brandenburg*, Lantgrave of *Thuringe*, and of almost all the other Princes of *Germany*; besides that the Kings of *Hungary*, *Sweden*, *Denmark*, *Norway*, and, in a word, those of *Spain*, except *Arragon*, shortly after adhered to that Council; and by consequent, all these Prelates, all these Doctors, all these Orders, all these Universities, all these Kingdoms, all these States, that's to say, in a word, almost all Christians, in the beginning of the fifteenth Century, when that Dispute was started concerning the Superiority of the Council or of the Pope, believed, conform to the Belief of Antiquity,

quity, That a Council is above the Pope.

But you are to take notice of somewhat more particular and convincing still. When five years after, the Council of *Constance* was opened, for continuing that of *Pisa*, as it had been decreed in that Council, which was rather interrupted than concluded, the Dispute concerning the Superiority of the Pope or of the Council, was started again with greater Heat than before. For some Cardinals being arrived from *Scaffhausen*, whither the Pope who had escaped from *Constance* had retired, attempted in full Assembly where *Sigismund* the Emperour was present, to prove that the Council was dissolved, because *John* XXIII. who had abandoned it, being owned for true Pope by all that were present, was above the Council which could have no Authority without him.

Then was there a general murmuring in the Assembly, and many

Etiã responsum fuit alacriter per plures de ipso concilio viros magnæ authoritatis & scientificos, scilicet quod Papa non esset supra Concilium, sed sub concilio, & facta est illic contentio magna hinc inde. Niem. in vit. Joann.

J. Gers. Serm. coram Concil.

of those who had greatest Authority and Reputation by reason of their Dignity and Knowledge, undertook to refute them, and to prove on the contrary, That the Council was superiour to the Pope, conform to the Sermon that the famous *John Gerson* had made to the Council a few days before, wherein he had made it out in twelve propositions, That a general Council representing the Universal Church, is above the Pope, not only in the doubt whether or not he be true Pope, but also in the Assurance that is to be had, whether he be lawfully chosen or not, as they did undoubtedly hold *John* XXIII. to have been.

Etiam ritè electi.

Wherefore that Question, both before and after the Sermon of *Gerson*, having been examined in the Conferences of Nations, according to the Order appointed by the Council, a Report of it was made in the fourth Session, where nine Cardinals and two hundred Bishops were present with the Emperour

Act. Concil. Constan. t. 12. con. Ed. Paris. Anton. tit. 22. c. 6. §. 2.

Sigiſmund, the Ambaſſadors of the Kings of *France*, *England*, *Poland*, *Norway*, *Cyprus*, *Navarr*, and many Princes of *Germany*; and there, ſeeing it had been already declared in the preceding Seſſion, that the Council ſubſiſted, and ſtill retained all its force and Authority, tho the Pope had withdrawn himſelf, it was by common Conſent thus concluded and defined: That *the Holy Council lawfully aſſembled, and repreſenting the Church Militant, hath received immediately from Jeſus Chriſt a Power which all and every one, even the Pope himſelf, are obliged to obey, in all that concerns the Faith, the extirpation of Schiſm, and the general Reformation of the Church of God, in its Head and Members.*

And to the end that it might not be ſaid what ſome have ſaid ſince without having carefully read the Council of *Conſtance*, that that is only to be underſtood during the time of a Schiſm, it is added to the Decree in the following Seſſion, *That whatever Pope refuſes to obey the De-*

Decrees not only of this Council, but alſo of any other that ſhall be lawfully called, ought to be puniſhed if he amend not.

The Council afterward exerciſes its ſovereign Authority over Pope *John* XXIII. acknowledged by them for true Pope, by the Church of *Rome*, and by all Chriſtian People, except a very few who ſtill adhered to the Schiſmaticks. *Martin* V. who was choſen Pope in place of *John* XXIII. in the forty fifth Seſſion, approved the Decrees which had ſolemnly been made in that Council, and proteſted that he would obſerve them inviolably. In fine, in the Bull wherein he enjoyns what is to be asked of Hereticks who return from their Hereſie, amongſt others this Article is put: *Whether they believe not that all Believers ought to approve and hold what the holy Council of* Conſtance, *repreſenting the Univerſal Church, holds and approves for the Integrity of the Faith and the Salvation of Souls; and whe-*

whether they condemn not and repute not condemned, what the ſame holy Council hath condemned and condemns as contrary to the Faith and good Manners. This, without doubt, is one of the moſt authentick Approbations that a Pope can give to a Council.

Now ſeeing, in compliance with a Decree of this Council, the Pope had called another at *Pavia*, afterward at *Sienna*, and laſtly at *Baſil*, where it was held fourteen Years after that of *Conſtance*, under *Eugenius* IV. who cauſed the Cardinal *Julian* of St. *Angelo*, named by his Predeceſſor for that Function, to preſide in it in his place, that Council in the ſecond Seſſion, when without contradiction it was very lawful, the Pope preſiding therein by his Legate, renewed thoſe two Decrees, and defined the ſame thing in the ſame terms, touching the Superiority of General Councils, to which Popes were obliged to ſubmit, in mat-

matters concerning the Faith, the extinction of Schism, and the Reformation of the Church in its Head and Members.

This was not all: for sometime after, *Eugenius* having sent the Archbishops of *Colossi* and *Taranto* to the Council, to represent the Reasons and Authority that he had to dissolve it, and to transfer it to another place: The Fathers, in a general Assembly, made a Synodal Answer by way of Confutation, containing more than twenty four large Pages; wherein having refuted all the Reasons whereby one of these Archbishops would have proved the Superiority of the Pope over a Council, they, on the contrary, evince by many Reasons, and by the Authority of the Council of *Constance*, and of the Gospel which remits St. *Peter* to the Church, that the Council which represents her hath all her Authority; and again define once more,

Respons. Synod. Sess. 6.

Septemb. 1432.

more, that the Council is above the Pope.

However, *Eugenius* diſſolved it contrary to the Advice of Cardinal *Julian* who preſided therein. But when he perceived that that began to produce very bad Effects, he made the Year following a new Conſtitution, whereby annulling and reſcinding all that he had done for diſſolving it, he declares, that that Council had lawfully continued till then from the Beginning, and approves whatever had been done in it, even ſo far, as to declare null certain Conſtitutions, in one whereof he declared, that in matters belonging to the Government of the Church, he had power over all Councils. And that was ſo authentick and ſolemn, that *Pius* II. even in the Bull of his Retractation, ingenuouſly confeſſes, that Pope *Eugenius* conſented to the Decrees of that Council, approved its progreſs and continuation, and recalled the Bull whereby he had diſſolved it. There

Ann. 1433.

Illas & alias quaſcunque & quicquid per nos aut noſtro nomine in præjudicium & derogationem ſacri Concilii B ſilienſis, ſeu contra ejus authoritatem factum, attentatum ſeu aſſertum eſt, caſſamus, revocamus, nullas & irritas eſſe declaramus.

Acceſſit & ipſius Eugenii conſenſus, qui diſſolutionem Concilii à ſe factam revocavit, & progreſſum ejus approbavit.

There are two Councils then without ſpeaking of that of *Piſa*, whereof the Council of *Conſtance* was a continuation, and two Councils in formal terms approved by two Popes, *Martin* V. and *Eugenius* IV. and theſe Councils determine, the one during the Schiſm, and the other after the Schiſm was extinct, that every Council repreſenting the Univerſal Church, is ſuperiour to the Pope. Now all the Doctors of that party which hold for the Pope's Superiority, acknowledge that a Council univerſal and approved, cannot err in its Deciſions; whence it may eaſily be concluded, that ſince the Decrees of theſe Councils, one is obliged to believe what all Antiquity before theſe Councils believed, that is, that an Oecumenical Council lawfully aſſembled, is above the Pope. I don't ſee how one can avoid this, without finding ways to invalidate the Authority of the Councils, and particularly

larly of that of *Conſtance*, which is held for the ſixteenth General Council. And this a modern Author hath attempted to do in a Book written on purpoſe, and laſt Year printed at *Antwerp* by *John Baptiſta Verduſſen*. We are now to ſee how he hath ſucceeded in it.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXII.

Of the Writing of the Sieur Emmanuel Schelſtrate *againſt theſe two Decrees of the Council of* Conſtance.

Ann. 1682. *Cleri Gallicani de Eccleſiaſticâ poteſtate declaratio.*

THree years ſince, the Clergy of *France* repreſenting the *Gallican* Church, being by Order of the King aſſembled at *Paris*, made an authentick Declaration in four Articles, of what they believe and define concerning Eccleſiaſtical Power, conform to the Holy Scriptures, Tradition, and the practice of the whole Church, and particularly of that of *France*. Amongſt other things, they declare in the ſecond Article, *That the Popes, Succeſſors of St.* Peter, *have in ſuch manner full power over the ſpiritual, That the Decrees of the holy Council of* Conſtance, *approved by the Holy Apoſtolick See, and contained in the fourth and fifth Seſſion, concerning the Authority of*

of General Councils, must also remain in their full force, and not at all be infringed. And they add, *That the Gallican Church approves not the Opinion of those who would weaken these Decrees, and rob them of all their force, saying that their Authority may be called in question; that they are not sufficiently approved, or that they extend not beyond the time when there is a Schism in the Church:*

Doubtless there is nothing more authoritative, (and at the same time more modest) than that Declaration of a Church so venerable in all Ages as the *Gallican* hath been, and which, next to that of the Apostles, hath always maintained, and made the Catholick Faith to flourish in *France* in its full Integrity, without having been ever suspected of the least Error. Nevertheless, there is a late Writer, to wit, the *Sieur Emmanuel Schelstrate*, Canon of *Antwerp*, and Under-Library-keeper of the *Vatican*, who, as he declares at first in the Scheme

of his Diſſertation, undertakes to overthrow all that the Clergy of *France* hath aſſerted concerning theſe Decrees, and to ſhew in three Chapters; firſt, that one may and ought rationally to doubt of their Authority; ſecondly, that it is only to be underſtood during the time of a Schiſm, and in regard of controverted Popes; and laſtly, that they are ſo far from being approved, that they have been manifeſtly rejected by an expreſs Bull.

Now ſeeing the authentick Acts which we have of the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* are in the hands of every Body, and owned for true for above two hundred and three-ſcore Years, and no man ever dream'd to call them into queſtion: he hath bethought himſelf of diſputing us that lawful and peaceable poſſeſſion, authoriſed by the long Preſcription of almoſt three hundred Years. And this he pretends to do, by oppoſing to us certain old Manuſcripts that he hath raiſed

raiſed out of the Grave, which contain the Regiſter and Acts of the Council of *Conſtance*, which had never been ſeen, as they are there, and which God, by a ſingular Providence, as he ſaith, hath ſuffered to be found almoſt at the ſame time when the *Gallican* Church made her Declaration; as if he would afford means of confounding it at the very Inſtant that it was publiſhed.

This, without doubt, is an Undertaking magnificently projected. But what is it founded upon? Upon the moſt ruinous Foundation in the World, and which I might eaſily overturn, and by conſequent all the Superſtructure, by ſaying in one word, which is moſt true, that the pretended good Manuſcripts that he produceth againſt us, after a Poſſeſſion of two hundred threeſcore and ten Years, are not more to be received, and are not near ſo good, as thoſe from which the Decrees that we have of the Council of *Conſtance* have been

taken. Should I anſwer him in this manner, it would lie at his door to prove that his Manuſcripts are better than ours, which he will never be able to do, as we ſhall preſently ſee. But to do him a favour, I am content not to handle them according to Rigour, only will clearly and calmly make it out to him, with all the reſpect that is due to his Character, that the Conſequences which he draws from what he finds there are falſe; and that after his way of arguing, all Oecumenical Councils might be ſtrip'd of the Authority which they ought to have, and which they have had in the Church to this preſent.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIII.

A Refutation of the firſt Chapter of the Diſſertation of M. Schelſtrate.

THIS Author undertakes to prove in this Chapter againſt the *Gallican* Church, That the Decrees of the fourth and fifth Seſſion of the Council of *Conſtance* are of dubious Authority; firſt, becauſe the Decree of the fourth Seſſion hath been corrupted by the Fathers of the Council of *Baſil*, who in the Extract that they cauſed to be made in the Year 1442. of the Decrees of the Council of *Conſtance*, omitted in the firſt Decree the words *ad fidem*, and added thereunto theſe words; *Et ad reformationem generalem Eccleſiæ Dei in capite & in membris: That all men, even the Pope, are obliged to obey that Council, in what concerns the Reformation of the Church in its Head and Members.* As to the

Omiſſion of the word *ad fidem*, he is ſo favourable as to excuſe it, for it appears only to have been done by the fault of the Tranſcriber, becauſe that word is generally to be found every where, and indeed ought to be there. As to the words which he pretends have been added, he confeſſes that they are in all the Editions of the Councils that have been hitherto made; becauſe, as he ſays, they have all followed the firſt that was made in the Year One thouſand four hundred fourſcore and nineteen, at *Haguenau*, from a Copy of that Extract of the Fathers of *Baſil*: but he pretends that it is not lawful, and that thoſe Fathers have added theſe Words; upon no other proof, but that they are not to be found in the ancient Manuſcripts which he hath ſeen.

Well, muſt it be allowed then upon a proof of this Nature, and a bare negative Argument which does

does not conclude, to accuſe a whole Aſſembly of Prelates of an Impoſture, in which a Cardinal preſided, a man of a very auſtere Virtue, whom Pope *Clement* VII. hath canonized? Let him be accuſed of Head-ſtrongneſs, and of abounding in his own Senſe, in what he thought to be juſt; I conſent to that, there was his weak ſide: but that he ſhould be taken for an Impoſtor and a Falſary, and be treated ſo, upon ſo bare a conjecture, is a thing that honeſt men can hardly ſuffer.

The Manuſcripts which *M. Schelſtrate* hath ſeen contain not theſe laſt Words of the Decree: be it ſo, we take it upon his Word, reckon him an honeſt man, and ſhall never accuſe him of having impoſed upon us, but only of having reaſoned ill, in concluding from thence, that the Fathers of *Baſil* have falſified that Decree: for who hath told him that the

Manuſcript from which the Fathers of *Baſil* made their Extract, contained not theſe words? Why does he, without being well aſſured of it, accuſe them of Impoſture? Don't we daily ſee, that there is difference amongſt ſeveral manuſcript Copies of one and the ſame work, that there is to be found in one what hath been omitted in another, and that therefore ancient Editions are corrected? Witneſs that true and famous Hiſtory of St. *Auſtin*, which the Fathers of *Saint Germander Prez* cauſe to be made from a great many Manuſcripts, the differences whereof they mark, and from ſome of which they take what they add to the ancient Editions which want certain words that are not to be found in the Copies from which they have been printed. Ought he not to preſume that that Copy of *Baſil* hath been taken from a Manuſcript that had theſe laſt Words, which he hath not found in

in his own, that ought to be reckoned defective?

And to prove to him that they are ſo, I declare, that thoſe which I have ſeen, and which are very ancient, have the ſame Words at the end of the Decree of the fourth Seſſion. And at the very Inſtant that I am writing this in my Apartment in the Monaſtery of St. *Victor* at *Paris*, where the Canons regular of that Royal Abbey have done me the favour to let me chuſe an honourable Retirement, ſuitable to my Profeſſion and way of Living. I have before me that famous Manuſcript of their celebrated Library, from which *Monſieur de Sponde* hath taken all that is moſt rare in his Hiſtory of the Council of *Conſtance*, which is certainly the fineſt part of his work. Now in this Manuſcript which is the moſt ancieat that can be ſeen, I read that Decree word for word as it ſtands in the printed Acts, and in the laſt Editions, the moſt

moſt exact and moſt correct of all.

But there's one thing ſtill more obſervable. We have in theſe Manuſcripts of St. *Victor*, the Extract of the Seſſions which they who were at the Council for the *French* Nation, ſent to *Paris*, as faſt as they got them; and that Decree of the fourth Seſſion is to be found therein in expreſs terms as we have it. Will *M. Schelſtrate* ſay, that the Council of *Baſil*, which was not held till many Years after the Council of *Conſtance*, hath falſified theſe Extracts? What can he anſwer to that?

And, that he may not think to object to us the multitude of his Manuſcripts, for he quotes nine of them, I can tell him that there are ten in *Paris*, all conform to that of St. *Victor*, which alone is worth all his. And certainly I can very well exceed that number, ſeeing I my ſelf, not to ſpeak of other Manuſcripts which they who are more cu-

curious than I am, without doubt, have in their Libraries, have diſcovered ten of them.

Beſides, we may produce againſt him the unqueſtionable Evidences of *Peter D' Ailly* Cardinal of *Cambray*, and of the famous *John Gerſon* Chancellor of the Univerſity of *Paris*, who was at the Council of *Conſtance*, not only as the Deputy of that great Body, but alſo as Ambaſſadour from the King: for, in fine, that holy and learned man, who cannot be ſuſpected of Impoſture, and whoſe Manuſcripts we have, in many places relates that firſt Decree of the fourth Seſſion, word for word, as it is in the Manuſcript of St. *Victor*, and the printed Acts; and what can never be anſwered, he related it even in preſence of the whole Council, in the Sermon which he made for the Journey of the King of the *Romans*; and having recited the Decree entirely with that Clauſe, *Ad generalem*

Tractat. de poteſtat. Eccleſiaſt.
Tract. an & quomodo licèt appel.
Serm. pro viagio Reg. Rom. directione prima.
Serm. coram Concil dom. ſecunda poſt Epiph.

neralem reformationem Ecclesiæ Dei in Capite & in Membris, immediately after he said to all the Fathers of the Council, declaring his Judgment, these very significant and expressive words.

I am of Opinion, that in all Churches, and in the most eminent Places of the World, this holy and most useful Definition, this Law or Rule of the Council, ought to be written, or even engraved, in great Letters, as being the fundamental and infallible Direction which we ought to follow against the horrible and monstrous Scandal, which is a stumbling Block that many amongst us have cast in the way of the Commands of God, determining, and endeavouring to prove by Texts of the Gloss ill understood, contrary to the Evangelical and Eternal Rule, that the Pope is not subject to a Ge-

Conscribenda prorsus esse mihi videretur in eminentioribus locis, vel inculpenda per omnes Ecclesias, salubertima hæc definitio, lex vel regula: tanquam directio fundamentalis &c. velut infallibilis, adversus monstruosum horrendumque offendiculum quod hactenus positum erat per multos de Ecclesia in itinere mandatorum Dei, determinantes ex textibus Glossæ, non ad regulam evangelicam & æternam acceptu, Papam non esse subjectum Generali Concilio, neque Judicari posse per ipsum: quod præterea Generale Concilium ab quocunque convocari, facit? Quoniam solutus erat legibus, & supra jus. Et ita de plurimis per quæ blanda, fallax & subdola adulatio fovebat libidinem dominandi, & in tyrannidem Ecclesiæ destructricem Papatum seu ejus usum convertebat, ita ut non pateret via reductionis seu pacis.

ipso robur immediatè sumebat, nec poterat sine eo casu vel stabiliri: quod nemo poterat ei dicere, Cur ita

neral

neral Council, and that he cannot be judged by it; beſides, that a General Council receives from him immediately all its force, and that in no caſe it can be called and held without him; that no man may ſay to him, Why do you do that? *becauſe he is not bound to obey the Laws, and that he is above all Canons: and many other ſuch Maxims, whereby a ſoft, fallacious, and malicious flattery fomented the unbridled deſire of predominating, and changed the Pontifical Power, or the exerciſe of it, into a Tyranny which wholly ruined the Church; ſo that there would no way remain of reducing matters into good Order, and of ſetling Peace.*

Now I would beſeech *M. Schelſtrate* to tell me ingenuouſly, if he dares think that the Chancellor of *Paris* had the Impudence to recite in a Sermon, and before all the Fathers of the Council, the Decree of the fourth Seſſion, otherwiſe than they themſelves had made it; and add impudently theſe words,

words, *Ad reformationem Eccleſiæ in Capite & in membris*, which the Council had not put into it; and afterwards to ſpeak to them in the manner I have now mentioned. I take him to be a man of too much Honour, and too prudent, ever to let that Thought enter into his Head; and I make no doubt but that he will give Glory to God by confeſſing, That ſince *Gerſon* recited that Decree before the whole Council as we have it in the printed Acts, it is altogether evident that the Council made it ſo, and that it is not in the leaſt falſified; that otherwiſe the Council would have given him the Lie as an impudent Impoſtor.

But what now if I ſhew that that ſo famous Doctor hath done the ſame oftner than once, as may be ſeen particularly in the Sermon which he made before all the Fathers of the Council, the ſecond Sunday after the *Epiphany*, upon

that

that Text of the Gospel, *There was a Marriage in* Cana *of* Galilee? There he treats very amply of the Marriage of Jesus Christ with his Church, represented by the Council of *Constance*; and having said that the second Advantage of that Spouse, is the fullness of Power that the Council which represents her hath even over the Pope, and that that was solidly proved in a Book lately before published; he speaks in this manner.

But what necessity is there to enlarge Discourse, or reason any more upon that Truth which hath been most clearly and solidly decided by this sacred Council, to which it is not lawful to gainsay, nor to bring that Question any ways under Examination again, to clear it by Arguments? for there would be no end of disputing; Evasions and frivolous Distinctions would always be found out, to betray

Quamvis ultra multiplicare sermonem quid opus est super eâ veritate; cujus decisio clarissima solidissimaque facta est per hoc sacrum Concilium, cui non licet obviii, nec ipsam in argumenta deducere quoniam disputationum & argumentationum, & evasionum frivolarum nullus unquam esset finis, sed casus assiduus in errores absurdos, insanos, & impios. Vere & graviter Ecclesiastes, Quia cito non profertur contra malos sententia, filii hominum absque ullo timore perpetrant mala. Nunquid non ideo sacra hujus sancti Constantiensis *impugnantur Judicia quæ sic habent?*

men

men into absurd, mad, and impious Errors. The Preacher hath truly and gravely said, that because Sentence against an evil Work is not executed speedily, therefore the Heart of the Sons of Men is fully set in them to do Evil: Is it not therefore that there are some who dare boldly impugn the Determinations and Decrees of this Council of Constance, *of which the Tenor follows?*

Primo declarat, &c. Here he relates at length the Decree of the fourth Session, with that Clause, *Et ad reformationem Ecclesiæ in capite & in membris*; and having done so, *This*, says he to the Fathers of the Council, *is the Decree that you have made*. Dare *M. Schelstrate*, after this, still say, that those of *Basil* have falsified that Decree, by adding thereunto those Words?

And since, for convincing him, he hath obliged me to alledge so authentick a Piece in that part of this excellent Sermon which *John* Ger-

Gerſon made to the Council of *Conſtance*, I ſhould be glad he might know what, after the Rehearſal of the Decree as we have it, that learned Doctor adds ſpeaking ſtill to the Council. Theſe are his own Words, which are very conſiderable. *Whoever oppoſes and contradicts that Truth founded upon the Rock of Holy Scripture, falls into the Hereſie that now hath been condemned, which no Divine, eſpecially of the Faculty of* Paris, *nor no Saint, ever maintained.* In this manner *Gerſon* ſpeaks of the Opinion of thoſe who will not have a Council to be above the Pope. We give it a ſofter term, and reject it, not as heretical, but as contrary to the Doctrine of Antiquity, and conſequently falſe.

Huic veritati fundatæ ſupra petram ſacræ Scripturæ quiſquis à propoſito detrahit, cadit in hæreſim jam damnatam, quam nullus unquam Theologus, maxime Pariſiensis, *& Sanctus aſſeruit.*

Then he goes on with greater force ſtill, and expreſſes himſelf in theſe Words. *I lately ſaw St.* Thomas *and St.* Bonaventure; *I have not here the Books of other Doctors. They allow the Pope the ſupreme and*

Vidi nuper Sanctum Thomam & Bonaventuram, hic reliquorum libros non habeo, dant ſupremam & plenam ſummo pontifici poteſtatem Eccleſiaſticam, rectè proculdubio, ſed hoc faciunt in comparatione ad fideles ſingulos & particulares Eccleſias. Dum etiam comparatio facienda fuiſſet ad auctoritatem Eccleſiæ Synodaliter congregatæ ſubjeciſſent Papam & uſum poteſtatis ſuæ eidem Eccleſiæ, tanquam matri ſuæ, cujus legem dimitti non debere tradit ſapiens; tanquam præterea regulæ vel legi directivæ infallibiliter, cui ſe ſubmittere tenetur omnis frater peccabilis de Eccleſia, cujus auctoritatem ſi non audierit frater quilibet, etiam Papa qui nobiſcum dicit Pater Noſter, *audiatur quid dixerit omni Catholico Chriſtus: ſit tibi, inquit ſicut Ethnicus & Publicanus, id eſt, excommunicatus.*

full Eccleſiaſtical Power; and without doubt they are in the right, becauſe ſaying ſo, they compare the Pope with all Believers and all Churches taken particularly. But if they had been to compare him with the Authority of the Church aſſembled in a Council, they would have ſubjected him, and the exerciſe of his Power, to the ſame Church, as to his Mother, whoſe Laws the Wiſe Man ſays one ſhould never forſake, and as to the Rule which directs us infallibly, and to which all men in the Church liable to failing, are obliged to ſubmit. And if any one, whoever he be, of our Brethren, though he were Pope, who ſays his Pater Noſter *as we do, will not acknowledge her Authority, and obey her, let us hearken to that which Jeſus Chriſt enjoyns to every Catholick, Let him be to you, ſaith he, as an Heathen and as a Publican; that is to ſay, as an excommunicate Perſon.* And this is juſt the ſame which the Pope *Silveſter* II. ſaid in expreſs terms many Ages before *Gerſon.*

Gerſon. And to prevent *M. Schelſtrate* from offering to ſay, that the Text of this Doctor hath been falſified, by adding thereunto theſe words, *Et ad reformationem Eccleſiæ in capite & in membris*; I declare unto him, that the Treatiſe *de poteſtate Eccleſiaſtica*, where that great man quotes that Decree, hath been collationed with four Manuſcripts, two of the Hiſtory of St. *Victor*, marked N N. S. and M M. 11. with one of the Colledge of *Navarr*, and of the Bibliotheke of *Monſieur Colbert*, marked 99. That the Treatiſe *An & quomodo appellare liceat à ſummo pontifice*, where the ſame Decree is to be found, is altogether conform to two Manuſcripts, one of St. *Victor* marked N N. 9. and the other of the Bibliotheke of *Navarr*. That the Sermon, *pro viagio Regis Romanorum*, hath in like manner moſt exactly been compared with a Manuſcript of St. *Victor*, marked according to the ancient Catalogues,

N N. 11. with one of the Bibliotheke of *Navarr*, and with one of the Library of *Monſieur Colbert*, marked 99. In a word, that what is to be read in the Sermon, *Nuptiæ factæ ſunt*, &c. wherein *Gerſon* repeated before the Council the Decree of the fourth Seſſion, is to be found in a very ancient Manuſcript of St. *Victor*, marked N N. 19. word for word as we have cauſed it to be printed.

All theſe Manuſcripts have been communicated to me by *Monſieur d' Herouval*, Regular Canon of St. *Victor*, and Doctor of the *Surbonne*, whoſe merit already well known to the Learned, will ſhortly be to the Publick, in the new Edition that he is preparing of the Works of *Gerſon*, which by his Care and Pains, will be found reſtored to their Perfection, that they have never hitherto had.

This, I think, is enough to oblige *M. Schelſtrate* to yield. Would he have any thing more preciſe?

He

He ſhall be ſatisfied. The Council of *Baſil*, ten Years before the Extract made, which he pretends they falſified, propoſed that Decree ſuch as we have it, and renewed the ſame in the ſecond Seſſion. Cardinal *Julian*, who was nominated by *Martin* V. to preſide in that Council, and who after the Death of that Pope preſided therein in Name of *Eugenius* IV. conſented to that Decree in behalf of the Pope in that ſecond Seſſion, and defended it in the Letter which he wrote to *Eugenius*, to remonſtrate to him the Reaſons which obliged his Holineſs not to offer to diſſolve that Council. Had not this Decree been that of *Conſtance* moſt faithfully propoſed, would he have conſented to it; Would not he have objected againſt that notorious Falſification? Would not he have proteſted, that what was added to the end of the Decree was no part of it, he who was very well acquainted with his

Et tibi prout opus videris eſſe juxta tibi injuncta & ordinata in Concilio Conſtantienſi *optimè provideas.* Julian. Ep. 2. ad Eugen.

Council of *Conſtance*, and daily ſtudied it, having expreſs Orders from *Eugenius*, to act in the Council of *Baſil*, as he ſhould find it expedient, according as he was enjoyned and directed by the Decrees of the Council of *Conſtance*.

Would he have more ſtill? Here is enough to ſatisfie him. *Eugenius* IV. in the Bull which he publiſhed during the ſixteenth Seſſion, declares, That, according to the Decrees of *Conſtance*, he had called the Council of *Baſil* for the Extirpation of Hereſies, the Peace of Chriſtian People, and the general Reformation of the Church *in Capite & in Membris*: and ſeeing the Council was lawfully aſſembled, it hath ſtill continued, and ſo ought to be continued, for procuring thoſe three ends, as if it had never been diſſolved. Then he reſcinds all that he had done for the diſſolution of it, proteſting that he approves it, and will have it to continue purely, ſimply, and with all

Qui nimo præfatam diſſolutionem irritam, & inanem declarantes, ipſum ſacrum concilium purè, ſimpliciter & cum effectu, ac omni devotione & favore proſequimur, & proſequi intendimus.

all Devotion and Favour. Thus the Pope ſpeaks, who when he was Cardinal was preſent at the Council of *Conſtance*, whoſe Decrees he could not be ignorant of; and by conſequent, if the Decree of the ſecond Council of *Baſil*, related in the ſame Council, as being that of *Conſtance*, had not been the ſame in proper terms, it is not to be doubted but that *Eugenius* would have affirmed it to be falſe, and have rejected it.

In fine, in the very ſame Manuſcript which *M. Schelſtrate* produces, there is to be found in the Preface of the Decree, as in our Acts, that, *This Holy Council of* Conſtance *lawfully aſſembled for the Extirpation of the preſent Schiſm, for the Union, and for the Reformation that ought to be made of the Church in its Head and Members, to the end that that Union and Reformation of the Church may the more eaſily, more ſurely, more amply, and*

more freely be obtained, ordains, declares, and defines as follows; to wit, That all men, of whatsoever Dignity they be, even Papal, are obliged to obey the Council in all things belonging to the Faith, and the Extirpation of this Schism. And who does not see that for compleating the Sense according to the Intention and expres words of the Council, one must not stop there, but that it must necessarily follow, *and to the Reformation of the Church in the Head and Members thereof?* So it is in our Copies which are true, and is wanting in his, which unjustifiable Omission makes them clearly appear to be defective.

But, says *M. Schelstrate*, one of my Manuscripts affirms, that the day before, and the very same day of the fourth Session, there were great Debates concerning the matters to be put into the Decree, and that at length by a sudden Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, all agreed, that nothing should be put

put into it but the Points that are to be ſeen in that Copy; and the other Manuſcript informs me, that the Emperour made them all agree by finding a moderation to which he brought the Cardinals to conſent. Now that is exactly what we would be at: I'll tell ye how. There were four Points to be examined relating to that Decree: firſt, Whether the Council hath received immediately from *Jeſus Chriſt*, a full Power to which the Pope himſelf is obliged to ſubmit in what concerns the Faith and the Extirpation of Schiſm; ſecondly, and if it ought to be put into it, *in what concerns the Reformation of the Church, in the Head and Members*; thirdly, whether in caſe the Pope would not obey it, he might be puniſhed; and fourthly, if all that ought to be underſtood of any other Council as well as of that of *Conſtance*.

As to the firſt, ſince all the Nations agreed upon it, it eaſily paſt; but

but as to the three others, ſome, and eſpecially the Cardinals, who, at leaſt, would therein gratifie the Pope, oppoſed them. Now the mean and moderation which the Emperour *Sigiſmund* found out to unite all diſſenting minds, was, that in the Decree of the preſent fourth Seſſion, the two firſt Points only ſhould be inſerted, and that for the other two they might afterwards conſider what was to be done about them in the following Seſſion. That appears manifeſtly by our Acts, by our Manuſcripts, and even by that of *M. Schelſtrate*, wherein, as I have juſt now proved, there is a neceſſity, conſidering that Proceeding, for making a rational and compleat Senſe, that theſe Words which have been omitted in it, be added, *And as to what concerns the Reformation of the Church in the Head and Members.*

This is more clearly ſtill to be ſeen in the fifth Seſſion which was held

held eight days after, and wherein for putting an end wholly to that Affair, and for propoſing without Interruption, and at one glance, what men ought to believe concerning that Point, they put in the firſt place the Decree of the fourth Seſſion word for word as we have it; and then made a Decree, by which the two other Points were defined and declared, to wit, that the Pope himſelf is obliged to obey not only that Council of *Conſtance* that was held during the Schiſm, but alſo all others; and that if he refuſe to ſubmit to them he may be puniſhed. And this is to be ſeen not only in our Acts and Copies, but likewiſe in the Manuſcript of *M. Schelſtrate*, as he himſelf confeſſes; and therefore he muſt acknowledge, that even though theſe Words, *for the reformation of the Church in the Head and Members*, had not been put into the Decree of the fourth Seſſion, as he pretends, yet that would not at all

all reach the bottom of the Affair, becauſe they are actually in the Decree of the fifth Seſſion. For to render a Decree authentick, what matters it in what Seſſion it hath been made?

After all, it muſt neceſſarily be concluded from what I have now ſaid as to theſe uncontroverted matters of Fact, that we ought not to correct the Council of *Conſtance*, according to the Manuſcripts of *M. Schelſtrate*. But on the contrary, it is his part to correct them according to ours, and according to the Council, as we have it. And ſo, the firſt Argument that he alledges why we ſhould doubt of the Authority of theſe Decrees, is null.

The other two are of the ſame force, and in a few words, may without any difficulty be overthrown. Seeing he cannot deny but that theſe two Decrees are in the fifth Seſſion, he ſaith what he hath learned from thoſe *Ultramontanus*

Au-

Authors who have written for the Superiority of the Pope againſt that Council; to wit, that they were made in a hurry, without ſufficient Deliberation, and againſt the Judgment of many who oppoſed them. This is the very ſame thing that the *Neſtorians*, nay and ſome of our Proteſtants, have ſaid againſt the Council of *Epheſus*, and againſt St. *Cyril*, whom they accuſe of having cauſed *Neſtorius* to be condemned with extream Precipitation, without hearing him, and without poſſibility of having the cauſe ſufficiently examined. All Hereticks might ſay as much, and do, indeed ſay ſo of all Councils which have condemned their Hereſie.

But, not to reſt on that, I maintain to *M. Schelſtrate*, that there never was a Queſtion better examined, than that which was moved in this Council. For, ſince the Council of *Piſa*, where it was firſt ſtarted, had decided in favour of the Council, it was almoſt the whole

whole Subject of Diſputes and Conferences, and was toſſed to and fro in the Council of *Conſtance* even before and after the Sermon of *John Gerſon*. Beſides, after that Aſſembly wherein all that the Cardinals who were ſent from the Pope objected, had been convincingly refuted, it was ſo well examined, that all the four Nations acquieſced in the Point.

I know very well, there were great Debates about it, and that the Cardinals oppoſed it; I even grant him what he hath found in his Manuſcript, and which he confeſſes had never been known before, and which, perhaps, is not true, that the Cardinals, nay and the Ambaſſadours of *France*, made a private Proteſtation in the Chamber of Preſence, that it was only for avoiding of Scandal that they aſſiſted at the fifth Seſſion, and not for conſenting to what they knew was to be defined in it. What can he conclude from thence? Hath not

not he read the Hiſtory of the *Conclaves*, where, after a thouſand Intrigues, a thouſand Oppoſitions, and a thouſand other things more than I can tell, at length a lawful Election is made, to which all the Cardinals who were ſo divided before, conſent? Let him read the Hiſtories of the Council of *Trent* written by *Fra. Paolo* and Cardinal *Pallavicini*, there he will find a great many Debates about Points that were to be decided in the Seſſions; and nevertheleſs the Holy Ghoſt, which unites all minds into one Judgment, made all the Decrees of that Council to paſs with the unanimous Conſent of all the Fathers who had been ſo divided before.

It is juſt ſo with this Council of *Conſtance*; I grant there may have been Oppoſitions, Conteſts, private Proteſtations, and whatever *M. Schelſtrate* pleaſes to inform us of from his Manuſcripts: yet when all is done, theſe Cardi-

dinals, and all they who debated and protested privately, were present at the fifth Session: and seeing the Holy Ghost unites all minds in a Council, to the end they may say, *Visum est spiritui sancto & nobis*, the two Decrees of that Session past by common Consent, as the Acts say, to which *M. Schelstrate* has nothing at all in his Manuscripts that can be objected. This is the Language of the Acts: *These Articles and Decrees having been read, the Council with a common Consent approved them.*

Quibus articulis sive constitutionibus lectis, concilium eos & eas uniformiter approbavit & concluſit.

In fine, the third Argument he makes use of to weaken the Authority of the Decrees of these two Sessions, is, that the Council being then only made up of those of the *Obedience* of *John* XXIII. could not represent the Universal Church. Now, to convince him of the Insignificancy of that Argument, which without doubt is the weakest of all, I need only tell him in two words, that what he supposes after

Bel-

Bellarmine, who hath ſupplied him with all his weak Objections, is very falſe. For almoſt all the Cardinals of the two *Obedientes* of *Gregory* XII. and *Benet* XIII. were united in the Council of *Piſa*, where theſe two pretended Popes, who by Colluſion played upon all *Chriſtendom*, were declared Schiſmaticks and Antipopes, and *Alexander* V. choſen, who was acknowledged for true Pope by moſt Churches, without any Competition, and eſpecially by the Church of *Rome*.

Now the ſame Cardinals and Biſhops who conſtituted that numerous Council, continued it at *Conſtance*, as Pope *John* XXIII. owned by the ſame Council for true Pope, declares in expreſs terms in the Buſl whereby he calls that Council, according as it had been decreed at *Piſa* five Years before. So that the *Obedience* of *John* XXIII. beſides the Concurrence of almoſt all the Kingdoms of *Chriſtendom*, nay and of the Church of *Rome* al-

ſo, was over and above compoſed of the greater and ſounder part of the two other who were re-united at *Piſa*, and continued that Council at *Conſtance*. If *M. Schelſtrate* pretend that the Abſence of thoſe who held for the one or other of thoſe two who had been declared Schiſmaticks and Antipopes, hinders the Council from being Oecumenical, he muſt know that his unjuſt Pretence would ruine moſt of the Oecumenical Councils; for the Hereticks that have been condemned in them might ſay, that thoſe of their Party who had right to be preſent in them, either were not there, or would not own them for lawful and Oecumenical Councils.

And Proteſtants might ſay the ſame, eſpecially of the Council of *Trent*, where neither the Biſhops of the Church of *England*, nor of *Denmark*, *Norway*, *Sweden*, and that part of *Germany* who followed the Confeſſion of *Ausbourg*, nor the

the Biſhops of *Greece*, of the *Eaſt*, and of *Egypt*, who own not the Pope for Head of the Church, and who are no more of his Obedience, than thoſe at the time of the Council of *Conſtance*, who held for *Pietro de la Luna* or *Angelo Corario*, were preſent. All theſe Biſhops, I ſay, of ſo great a part of the Chriſtian World, were abſent from the Council of *Trent* when it made its Decrees, and would not own it. Is there any thing more certain? And nevertheleſs *M. Schelſtrate* is obliged to confeſs with all other Catholicks, that their Abſence could not hinder that Council from being Oecumenical, becauſe for making it univerſal, it is enough that all be invited to it, as they were, and that they might be preſent there if they pleaſed, or if the Princes on whom they depend gave them leave. So that the Abſence of the Prelates who were the Dregs of thoſe two Obediences, hinders not but that the

Decrees of *Conſtance* are the Definitions of an Univerſal Council, and that they have an infallible Authority.

But there is ſtill ſomewhat that preſſes more home: for if it were not ſo, and if it were to be approved which *Bellarmine* ſays before *M. Schelſtrate*, that theſe Decrees have no Authority, by reaſon of that Abſence, and that there was no Pope in Council when they were made, ſtrange things would follow from thence. In the firſt place, the Condemnation of the Errors of *Wicleff* and *John Huſs* would be null, becauſe they were
Seſſ. 15. condemned in the *fifteenth* Seſſion, before the Union of the remnant of thoſe two *Obediences*, and when as yet there was no Pope there in the Council. Secondly, that deteſtable Propoſition of *John Petit*, that any private man might meritoriouſly kill a Tyrant, any way whatſoever, would not be lawfully condemned of Hereſie by the ſame

rea-

reason. And lastly, that the Condemnation, and afterwards the Deposition of *John* XXIII. which happened long before the Union of the two *Obediences*, must have been made without any lawful Power.

Sess. 8.

Cardinal *Julian*, who presided in the Council of *Basil* for Pope *Eugenius*, wrote this to him to take him off of his design of dissolving it because of the Decrees of the second Session. And would to God Cardinal *Bellarmine* and *M. Schelstrate* had read and considered that Letter before they made an Objection that draws after it so dangerous Consequences! *I am obliged*, said he to him, *most holy Father, to remonstrate to your Holiness, that if the Decrees of* Constance, *which the Council of* Basil *has renewed, have no Authority, that whereby* John XXIII. *was deposed, is of no force. If it be so, the Election of* Pope Martin V. *which was made during the Life of* John XXIII. *is null, and consequently that of your Holiness,*

Nam siquis dixerit decreta illius concilii non esse valida, necesse habet fateri privationem olim Joannis factam vigore illorum decretorum non valuisse. Si illa non valent, nec etiam Papa Martini tenuit electio facta illo superstite. Si Martinus non fuit Papa, nec sanctitas vestra est, quæ per Cardinales ab ipso factos electa est, &c. Ep. 2. Juliani ad Eugen.

seeing you must then have been elected by Cardinals of his Creation who was not Pope. By the same reason it is evident, that all the other Elections made since *Martin* V. until the present Pope, must be unlawful.

M. Schelstrate, without doubt, will answer to that, that *John* XXIII. consented to his Condemnation, and even ratified it when he was at liberty. But he must needs have done so, considering the condition he was in; and it is enough to read the very Author who is cited, that is *Leonard Aretin*, to be informed that the poor deposed Pope went to *Florence* to cast himself at the feet of *Martin* V. only because he knew not whither to betake himself, and that he was informed, that it was resolved, that if he did it not, his Person should be seised, and confined to perpetual Imprisonment. And besides, is it not well known that the Ratification cannot be good if the Act that is ratified be null?

Consilio Martini cognito (id erat ut Mantuae perpetuo carcere teneretur) antequam, &c. Leonard Aretin. Hist. ver. Italic.

Bel-

Bellarmine's Anſwer has as little force: *Though*, ſaith he, *the Council without the Pope cannot determine new Doctrines of Faith, yet it may judge during a Schiſm, who is the true Pope, and provide a true Paſtor for the Church, when there is none certain.* In the firſt place he grants by that, that all which the Council determined againſt *Wicleff*, *John Huſs*, and *Jerome of Prague*, and againſt that damnable Propoſition of *John Petit*, is null, as having been decided by an incompetent Judge: Who dare maintain ſuch a thing? Secondly, it is abſolutely falſe that a General Council, without the Pope, cannot make Decrees concerning the Faith. Did not the firſt Council of *Conſtantinople* make ſuch againſt *Macedonius*, concerning the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt? And did not the fifth condemn the Hereſie of the three Chapters, not only without Pope *Vigilius*, but likewiſe contrary to his Conſtitution, who would

Etſi concilium ſine Papa non poteſt definire nova dogmata fidei, poteſt tamen judicare, tempore Schiſmatis, quis ſit verus Papa, &c. L. 2. de Conc. c. 19.

have had them not to be condemned? Beſides, it was not the Buſineſs of that Council to judge who was the true Pope: for the Council of *Conſtance* never queſtioned but that *John* XXIII. was, it would only have had him perform the Promiſe which he made to renounce his Right, and freely to lay down, for Peace ſake, tho he was true Pope. And in the fourth place, if that Council was not then, as he called it before, but a particular Council where a third part of the Church only met, it could not lawfully have condemned *John* XXIII; becauſe, as all agree, none but an Oecumenical Council, repreſenting an Univerſal Church, hath that Power and ſupreme Authority; nay, and many deny that it can, unleſs in caſe of Hereſie, proceed againſt any Pope, much leſs if that Council held him for a true Pope, as the Council of *Conſtance* owned *John* XXIII. to have been.

From

From all this it follows, that the three Reaſons alledged by *M. Schelſtrate* in as many Articles, to prove againſt the Clergy of *France*, that one may doubt of the Authority of the Decrees of the fourth and fifth Seſſion of the Council of *Conſtance*, are not only falſe, but alſo of dangerous conſequence to the Church. Thus we have diſpatched his firſt Chapter: the other two will not long hold out.

CHAP. XXIV.

A Refutation of one of the two Chapters of M. Schelſtrate.

THis Writer, in one of theſe Chapters, pretends to prove, that thoſe Decrees of the fourth and fifth Seſſion are not approved. I have already made it out, that *Martin* V. approved them twice ſolemnly; once, by ordaining that thoſe who return from Hereſie ſhould be interrogated, whether or

or not they approved, without Exception, all which that Council approves, and condemned all that it condemns; and another time in the laſt Seſſion, where he declares, that he approves, and will inviolably obſerve, all the Decrees that have been made in that Council concerning matters of Faith, and as he expreſſes it by a new word, *Conciliariter*. Upon which, two Objections are raiſed againſt us.

The firſt, from theſe Words, *concerning matters of Faith*: from which *M. Schelſtrate* concludes, that the Pope hath only approved the Decrees againſt *Wickleff*, and *John Huſs*, *becauſe they alone*, ſaith he, *concern matters of Faith*. What then will become of the other Decrees that were made for the Extirpation of Schiſm, and for the Reformation of the Church, which are the two principal Points for which the Council and the Popes *Martin* and *Eugenius*, in expreſs terms, declare that the Holy Synod, re-

repreſenting the Univerſal Church, was called?

Let him tell me, whether thoſe Decrees be approved or not: if they be not, he muſt then, according to his Principles, grant that the Depoſition of *John* XXIII. is null, that all that followed upon it is invalid, and that all the good Laws that were made in that Council for Reformation, are of no Authority, and oblige no Man. And if they be approved, it is not to be doubted but that thoſe of the fourth and fifth Seſſion are alſo approved, ſeeing they were chiefly made for the extinction of Schiſm. For if the Council were not above the Pope, even lawfully elected, as *John Gerſon* ſaith, and if it had not Power to depoſe him, when that is neceſſary for the common Good of the Church, in caſe of Hereſie, Schiſm, or enormous Scandal, as it hath happened oftner than once; the Council could never have compelled the Pope, who was acknowledged to be true and

lawful, to renounce his Right for peace ſake.

The other Objection brought againſt us is weaker ſtill than the former. Cardinal *Bellarmine*, whom *M. Schelſtrate* hath followed ſtep for ſtep, upon that word *Conciliariter*; from which he concludes, that theſe Decrees of *Conſtance* have not been approved by Pope *Martin* V. becauſe the Pope declares, that he only approves thoſe which have been made *Conciliariter*, or, as that Cardinal interprets it, in the manner as other Councils have made their Decrees, the Matter having been diligently examined. Now it is ſure, adds he, with the greateſt Confidence imaginable, and as if no body could doubt of the truth of what he ſays, without ſo much as bringing any proof for it, the thing being clear in it ſelf: It is then, ſays he, moſt certain, that that Decree of the Superiority of a Council was made by the Council of *Conſtance* without any Examination, *ſine ullo examine*.

Id eſt more aliorum Conciliorum, re diligenter examinata, conſtat autem hoc decretum ſine ullo examine factum à Concilio Conſtantienſi. L. 2. de Concil c. 19.

I have

I have two things to ſay to that; firſt, that a manifeſt Falſhood was never aſſerted with ſo much Boldneſs: for never was there a Queſtion examined nor debated in the Council with greater heat than this, as I have already made it appear, and as it even appears by the Manuſcript of *M. Schelſtrate.* For there it is to be ſeen, that before the fourth Seſſion, the Deputies of the Nations, and the Cardinals, after many Conteſts and Oppoſitions of the ſame Cardinals, all agreed, by a ſudden Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt, in one Judgment concerning that Point of the Superiority of a Council over the Pope, who ought to obey it in what relates to Faith and the Extirpation of Schiſm. And he adds, that before the fifth Seſſion, which was not held till eight days after, and wherein, according to himſelf, it was defined, that the Pope ought to obey the Council in what concerns the Reformation of the Church in the Head

Habita fuit non modica diſceptatio inter D. Regem D. D. Cardinales & deputatos nationum, &c.

Die Sabbati 6 Aprilis, cum per prius inter D. D. Cardinales & Nationis altercatum fuiſſet — tandem ordinatum & concluſum eſt, &c.

Head and Members, there fell out again great Debates betwixt the Cardinals and the Deputies of the Nations. How can it then be ſaid ſo boldly, without bogling, as Cardinal *Bellarmine* hath done, *Nullo facto examine?* I declare that it is a thing I cannot comprehend, after the unqueſtionable Teſtimonies that I have before alledged to the contrary.

The next thing that I have to ſay againſt the Anſwer of *Bellarmine*, is, that that word *Concilia-riter* ſignifies not only, as he hath interpreted it, the matter in queſtion having been well examined, but alſo being afterwards ſolemnly decided in a Seſſion of the Council, without which nothing is defined. In the Council of *Conſtance* Votes went by Nations. There were at firſt four, the *Italian*, *Engliſh*, *French*, and *German*, and afterward the *Spaniſh* was added. The Deputies of every Nation conſulted firſt ſeverally; and then all the Nations communicated their Opi-

Opinions: after which, all theſe Nations held an Aſſembly, where every private Perſon had liberty to ſpeak and give his Voice, yet all the Voices made but one Suffrage for each Nation, though they differed in the number of Prelates and Doctors.

In fine, when they were all agreed, after much diſputing and debate, that was no more but preliminary, and a neceſſary Condition to a final Deciſion, which was only made in a General Aſſembly of Cardinals, Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Generals of Orders, Ambaſſadors of Princes, and, in a word, of the whole Council, with great Ceremony, after high Maſs, Litanies, and other Prayers, in the publick Seſſion held in the Cathedral Church, where after that a Cardinal or Biſhop having from the Pulpit read the Decrees and Articles framed in the Aſſembly of the Nations, demanded if they approved them: it was ſtill free to every one to ſay what he

plea-

pleaſed concerning them. And when they had all unanimouſly ſaid *Placet*, *We conſent to them*, as they never failed to do after theſe previous Deliberations, ſhorter or longer, according to the greater or leſs difficulty of the matters that they had examined; then was the Decree authentically made, and had its full force: and that, in the terms of *Martin* V. is called a Decree made *Conciliariter*.

In this manner the Errors of *Wickleff* were condemned in the eighth Seſſion; that of *John Huſs*, and the damnable Propoſition of *John Petit*, in the fifteenth; definitive Sentence pronounced againſt *John* XXIII. who was depoſed in the twelfth; and the Decrees of the Superiority of the Council made in the fourth and fifth Seſſion. Before that, the Council had determined nothing at all, nor laid any Obligation upon Believers.

This

This the Pope, like a very knowing man, expresses in the terms he makes use of, approving the Council, in the five and fortieth Session. The Colledge of Cardinals and of the Nations, concluded, that a certain Book of *F. John Falkenberg*, full of Heresies, ought to be condemned: The Ambassadors of the King of *Poland*, and of the great Duke of *Lithuania*, who concerned themselves in that Condemnation, publickly besought the Pope to condemn it in full Session before the conclusion of the Council, according to the Resolution taken by the Cardinals and the Nations; and they pressed him to it in so offensive a manner, that they protested in name of those Princes their Masters, that in case of a refusal, they appealed to the next Council.

Seeing these Ambassadors had spoken so haughtily, and in so disobliging a manner, under the specious Pretext of an extraordinary

Zeal for the Faith; and that besides it was not at all to the purpose, that the Pope, in the present Juncture, should give cause to think, that he thought himself obliged to submit to what the Cardinals and Nations had determined in their Assemblies: he weighed his Words, and answered very prudently, making it by his Answer appear, that on the one hand he was not wanting to comply with his Obligations; and on the other, that he knew very well how to preserve his Rights and Liberty.

For he told them, that he would always inviolably observe and stick to what the Council had decided in matter of Faith, *Conciliariter*. That shews that he had at least as much Zeal for the Faith as these Ambassadors had, who pressed him in so disrespectful a manner to condemn a Book. And at the same time he adds, that he approves all the Decrees which the Council had made authentically,

and according to the forms *Conciliariter*, but not at all what was done otherwiſe; as if he would give them to underſtand, that tho he be obliged to obey the Council, and inviolably to approve and obſerve what hath been defined in the Seſſions, yet he is not at all bound to ſubmit to what the Cardinals and Nations might conclude in their Aſſemblies, without the Authority and Approbation of the Council in their Seſſions. This, I think, may undeceive *M. Sabelſtrate*, who pretends, that the Pope, by ſpeaking ſo, makes it appear, that he is above the Council: he ought to ſay above, not the Council, but the Colledge of Cardinals, and the Aſſemblies of the Nations, when they are not authoriſed in the Seſſions.

And therefore, when one of the Ambaſſadors of the King of *Poland* would ſtill appeal to the next Council, the Pope commanded him Silence upon pain of Excom-

munication; and he did very well, becauſe that Appeal was manifeſtly raſh, abuſive, and unwarrantable, it being moſt evident, that a bare Reſolution of the Cardinals and Nations, without the Authority of the Council, could not oblige the Pope. And this was the reaſon why *Martin*, juſtly provoked by ſo unworthy a Proceeding, made ſhortly after a Bull, which he cauſed to be read, not in the Council, but in a publick Conſiſtory, whereby he declares, that it is not lawful for any one to appeal from the Holy See, or the Pope, nor to decline his Judgment in caſes of the Faith, which, as being greater Cauſes, ought to be brought before the Pope, and Holy Apoſtolical See.

Joan. Gerſon. Tract. an & quomodo poſſit appellari à Papa.

M. Schelſtrate alledges theſe words as his laſt Argument which he thinks invincible, to prove that the Pope is abſolutely above all Councils. But it is very eaſie to give him an Anſwer that hath been

an

an hundred times made without Reply, That theſe Words, and others of the like nature, ought to be underſtood with relation to all Churches taken particularly, to all Biſhops, Archbiſhops, Primates, and Patriarchs, from the Judgment of any of whom Appeals may be made to the Pope, and not to any of them from the Judgment of the Pope who is their Superiour, not when they are aſſembled in Body in a General Council repreſenting the whole Church; but when they are taken ſeparately and each of them in particular, according to theſe Words of St. *Auſtin* in his ſecond Book of Baptiſm againſt the *Donatiſts*: *Who knows not that St.* Peter, *by reaſon of the Primacy of his Apoſtleſhip, ought to be preferred before any other Epiſcopacy whatſoever?* He ſays, before every Epiſcopacy, and not before all Epiſcopacy in a General Council. So that that Bull of *Martin* V. no more than another of *Pius* II.

Quis neſcit illum Apoſtolatus principatum cuilibet Epiſcopatui præferendum. l. 2. de Bapt. contra Donatiſt. c. 1.

which begins *Execrabilis*, cannot absolutely condemn and forbid the Practice, but only the Abuse that may be made of an Appeal to a General Council, by appealing to it rashly, without Reason and a lawful Cause, as those Ambassadors of *Poland* and *Lithuania* did.

If, notwithstanding all this, *M. Schelstrate* will have the Pope, by that Bull, absolutely to condemn all Appeals to a General Council, which nevertheless it doth not express; he may be answered without difficulty, that were it so, yet it could be of no force, because it was not made *Conciliariter*, and *sacro approbante Concilio*, nor with the consent of the Church, which hath never pretended but that in certain Cases Appeals may be made from the Pope to a Council. To be persuaded of this, he need only read the Treatise written upon that Subject by that learned and holy man *John Gerson*, Chancellor of the University of *Paris*, and the Decla-

Quomodo & an liceat à summo pontifice appellare, & ejus Judicium declinare?

Declaration which that famous Univerſity made by an authentick Act to *Philip the Fair*, that a Council might be called, and appealed unto, againſt *Boniface* VIII. and that the Univerſity conſented and would ſtick, according to the holy Canons, to that Convocation and Appeal, which the King and all *France* made to the Council. Decl. Univ. Pariſ. Ann. 1303. menſe Septemb.

If I miſtake not, I have hitherto ſhewed the Weakneſs, or rather, the Nullity of what *M. Schelſtrate* objects, and that *Martin* V. ſolemnly approved the Decrees of the fourth and fifth Seſſion, by the Declaration which he made in the laſt Seſſion, and by the Queſtions that he will have to be put to Hereticks that are converted. But though we had not thoſe two ſo formal Declarations of that Pope, would our Author make no account of that of Pope *Eugenius*, concerning which it hath not pleaſed him to tell us one word? Nevertheleſs, he cannot be ignorant,

Basilienſe *concilium initio quidem fuit legitimum, nam & legatus aderat Pontificii, & Epiſcopi plurimi.* Bellar. l. 3. de Eccleſ. Milit. c. 16. & l. 2. de Conc. c. 19.

rant, that the Council of *Baſil*, which all men, even Cardinal *Bellarmine* himſelf, own to be lawful, in the ſecond Seſſion after its firſt opening renewed thoſe Decrees of *Conſtance*, which were approved by the Cardinal of *St. Angelo Juliano Cæſarini*, who preſided therein in name of that Pope. Nor do I doubt but that he knows, that *Eugenius* IV. himſelf, in the Bull which he made during the time of the ſixteenth Seſſion, approved all that the Council till then had done, and conſequently theſe Decrees of *Conſtance* renewed in the ſecond Seſſion, and the Synodal Anſwer wherein the ſame Council anew confirms thoſe Decrees, and backs them with very ſtrong Reaſons, which are there ſpecified at length.

And now I have but two words to ſay to *M. Schelſtrate* concerning the Approbation of theſe Decrees. Firſt, if he be not ſatisfied with it, he muſt of neceſſity reckon as null all the Decrees which the firſt Coun-

Councils made againſt the *Arians*, *Macedonians*, and the other Hereticks, becauſe it is never to be found, that theſe Councils have been approved, neither ſo formally, nor ſo many times, as the Decrees of *Conſtance* have been, by the Popes *Martin* V. and *Eugenius* IV.

Again, that he ought to know, as I have formerly made it appear, that in the Ancient Church no other Approbation nor Confirmation was ever known to have been made of Councils by the Popes, but the conſent which they themſelves, as well as others, were obliged to give to them. For, if after that the Councils of *Nice* and *Conſtantinople* which were lawfully aſſembled in the Holy Ghoſt, had defined the Conſubſtantiality of the Word, and the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, the Popes *Silveſter* and *Damaſus* would not have received theſe Decrees, nor have approved them; it is certain that they would have been

been reputed Hereticks by the whole Church; Who can doubt of that? And these Councils would have been no less infallible than they were in making their Definitions, by the Inspiration of that divine Spirit, which is the Soul of all Oecumenical Councils, according to these Words, *Visum est spiritui sancto & nobis.*

For to say that all the Authority of Councils is derived from the Pope, who may not follow and approve their Decisions concerning the Faith, and thereby take from them all their force, is an error condemned by the learned Cardinal of *Cambray*, *Peter D' Ailly*, in most significant terms, when preaching before the whole Council of *Constance* and Pope *Martin* V. in the Year 1417. the second Sunday in *Advent*, about a month after the Election of that Pope, he related the whole History of the Council which the Apostles celebrated at *Jerusalem*, and then expressed

preſſed himſelf in theſe Words: *By that it is manifeſt, that the Authority of deciding and defining ought not to be attributed to the Pope alone, but to the whole General Council; whence it follows, that the moſt pernicious and dangerous Error to the Church, of ſome men, ought to be condemned, who, to flatter the Pope, ſo rob the Council of its Authrity, that they have the Boldneſs to ſay, that the Pope is not of neceſſity obliged to follow the Deciſions of the Council; and that on the contrary, we ſhould reſt upon the Judgment of the Pope, if he oppoſe that of the Church, or of a General Council.*

Manifeſtè reprobatur error quorundam perniciosiſſimus, & toti Eccleſiæ periculoſiſſimus, qui adulando poteſtati Papæ, ita detrahunt Authoritati ſacri Concilii, &c.

Thus that great Cardinal, from the chair of Truth before the whole Council of *Conſtance*, conform to its Decrees, and in preſence of the Pope himſelf, who found no fault with it, and ſeemed not at all diſpleaſed, that that Opinion was called *an Error moſt pernicious and moſt dangerous, invented by the Flatterers of Popes.*

So

Decr. Facult. Ann. 1429. Kal. April.

So also the sacred Faculty, following so good an Example, about twelve years after made *F. John Seraſin* retract that Propoſition which he had put into one of his *Theſes*: *All the Authority that gives force to the Decrees of a Council, reſides in the Pope alone.* He was obliged to make a publick recantation, and to change his Propoſition into this, *All the Authority that gives force to the Decrees of a Council, reſides not in the Pope alone, but chiefly in the Holy Ghoſt and Catholick Church.*

Tota auctoritas data vigorem ſtatutis reſidet in ſolo ſummo pontifice.

Tota auctoritas data vigorem ſtatutis reſidet non in ſolo ſummo pontifice, ſed principaliter in Spiritu Sancto & in Catholica Eccleſia.

And certainly it is very rational that the Pope ſhould depend upon the Will of the Holy Ghoſt, who teaches, as it pleaſes him, all Truth to the Church, and to the Council which repreſents it; and not that the Holy Ghoſt ſhould depend upon the Will of the Popes, as it muſt needs do, if after that divine Spirit hath by the Council defined the Conſubſtantiality of the Word, the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, the Unity of Perſon, and the Plurality of

f Natures, Wills and Operations n *Jesus Christ*, and such other ruths concerning the Faith, his Decisions had no Authority, if it leased not the Pope to consent to hem. And this, I think, is suffi-ient in relation to the Approbation f the Decrees of *Constance*: one ord more as to what *M. Schelstrate* retends, that they were only made or the time of a Schism.

CHAP. XXV.

A Refutation of the other Chapter of M. Schelstrate.

THis Objection that is made a-gainst us, is of an old ruinous Engine ready to fall of it self, tho we set no strong hand to it to push it down. The truth is, the Council of *Constance*, which fore-saw that it might be made use of to weaken the supreme Authority of Oecumenical Councils, did antici-pate and overthrow it even before it

it was made; and for that end, in the fifth Session, wherein it declared that all men of what Dignity soever, are obliged to obey the Decrees and Ordinances of that sacred Council of *Constance*, these words are added, *And of any other General Council lawfully assembled.* He that speaks of any other Council without Restriction, comprehends all times, both out of Schism and during a Schism. So the Council of *Basil* which was a long time lawful, when there was no Schism declared that the Pope was obliged to obey it, and every other Council; and the Reasons given for it in that long Synodal Answer approved by Pope *Eugenius*, necessarily comprehend all times, as may be seen in the two Reasons which only I shall alledge.

Et cujuscunque alterius Concilii Generalis legitimè congregati.

The first is, That an Oecumenical Council is a *whole*, and a Body whereof the Pope, or he that presides in it in his place, is the Head. For there is no Acephalous Council, as *M. Schelstrate* speaks, that

is to ſay, without a Head, calling that of *Conſtance* ſo in the Abſence of the Pope. Nay if he refuſe to preſide when he might, or withdraw himſelf from it, there is always ſome body that preſides therein in his place; and repreſents him in that quality of Head, as the whole Council repreſents the Univerſal Church; and it will be acknowledged without difficulty, that the Head is no more but the chief Member and principal Part of that great Body, as Saint *Gregory*, ſpeaking of Saint *Peter*, poſitively affirms.

Certè Petrus Apoſtolus primum membrum univerſalis Eccleſiæ eſt. Gregor. l. 4. Ep. 8.

Not as Jeſus Chriſt, who is not only the Head, but alſo the Maſter of the Univerſal Church which he hath purchaſed with his own Blood; and by conſequent it is his Church, it properly belongs unto him, and he can diſpoſe thereof as he thinks fit, as an Owner can do with his Eſtate, *Dominus eſt*. Hence it is that he cannot be ſaid to be but a part of the Church: he is over all, as God who is the abſolute Maſter

Dominus Univerſi, non eſt pars univerſi. Ariſt. 12 Metaph.

fter of the World, is not a part of that *whole*, of that Univerſe whereof he is the Maſter, as *Ariſtotle* himſelf hath acknowledged.

It is not ſo with the Pope, who is indeed Head of the Church Univerſal, but not Maſter, Jeſus Chriſt having ſaid to St. *Peter*, as well as to all the other Apoſtles: *The Princes of the Gentiles exerciſe Dominion over them; but it ſhall not be ſo among you.* And that entirely ruines that odious Compariſon that ſome would make between our Kings, who are over the States of their Kingdom, and the Popes whom they would place over the whole Church. There is a great deal of Difference: Our Kings are the Maſters in their States, *exerciſe Dominion over them*; but not the Popes in the Church, *but it ſhall not be ſo with you.* The Pope then is but a part of the Church, and of a General Council that repreſents it, and not the Maſter.

Matth. 20. Mark 12. Luke 22.

Now

Now it is evident by the light of Nature, that the *whole* is more noble than every part, and carries it over them, according to that ſentence of St. *Auſtin*, *Univerſum partibus ſemper optimo Jure præponitur.* And upon that Maxim received of all Men without contradiction, St. *Jerome* in one word derides that queſtion, when he ſaith, *Major eſt Authoritas orbis quam urbis.* Thus the Pope as the chief part and Head of the univerſal Church, is above every part, and his power regulated according to the Canons extends over all the Churches taken particularly, and none are exempt from his Juriſdiction, but no ways over all the Churches aſſembled in a General Council, unleſs it be for calling of them, and preſiding therein. And in this manner is to be underſtood what is to be found in the Bulls of *Eugenius* IV. and *Leo* X. in the Councils of *Florence* and the *Lateran*, beſides that this laſt is not agreed upon to be an univerſal Council.

L. de Bapt. c. 4.

Ep. ad Evagr.

The other reaſon of the Council of *Baſil* in its Synodal Anſwer is, that an Ecumenical Council hath received the gift of Infallibility as well as the univerſal Church, which it repreſents; and that the Pope may err, as I have proved it to have been the belief of all Antiquity. But to avoid diſputing: This reaſon may be ſet off in a ſtronger and more convincing manner, by ſaying, They who hold an opinion contrary to that of the Superiority of a Council, are ſtill ready to grant that during a Schiſm it is above the Pope, who is controverted, becauſe what is certain ought always to be preferred before the uncertain. This is a Principle then agreed upon on both ſides, from whence it may be thus argued.

It is certain that a general Council repreſenting the Univerſal Church is Infallible; no Catholick can doubt of this. On the other hand it is not certain that the Pope is ſo, ſeeing many very able and Catholick

Catholick Doctors, and moſt famous Univerſities, not only doubt of it, but teach and vigorouſly maintain that he is not. Hence it muſt neceſſarily be concluded, that, ſeeing what is certain ought to be preferred before the uncertain: The tribunal of a Council which, as it is certainly known, cannot err in its determinations, is over that of the Pope, who, perhaps, may be deceived, there being no certainty of his Infallibility.

It is evident that thoſe two reaſons of the Council of *Baſil*, when it was very lawful and approved by Pope *Eugenius*, make it appear that every General Council is above the Pope, both in the time of a Schiſm, and when there is no Schiſm; ſeeing in both times the Council is a *whole*, of which the Pope is but a part; and that it is certain that in both theſe times the Council is alike Infallible; and that at leaſt, it is not certain that the Pope is, neither

in the one nor other of theſe times.

Having ſaid ſo much, I think I have fully anſwered *M. Schelſtrate* as to what he hath alledged in the diſſertation that he hath made againſt one of the chief Articles of the Declaration of the Clergy of *France*. For as to the long diſcourſe which that Author makes in one of his Chapters, to perſuade us, upon the credit of his Manuſcript, that after great debates among the Nations it was at length reſolved, by common conſent, that the Reformation of the Church in the Head and Members ſhould not be attempted 'till after the election of the Pope: It is without doubt pitiful and deſerves not any anſwer.

Can it be concluded from thence that a Pope lawfully elected, who is preſent and preſides in the deliberations of a Council, is not a part of that *whole* and of that Body which repreſents the Univerſal Church, whoſe Authority ought to

to be preferred before that of any of its Members in particular, by that reaſon which proves that the *whole* is greater and more noble than any of its parts? And by what Philoſophy does he pretend to make us acknowledg, that from the preſence of a Pope in a Council, it follows that that Pope is not obliged to ſubmit to the Decrees that may be made in it, even contrary to his own Judgment, when they are carried by the plurality of Voices, whether it be of individual Perſons or of Nations? That is the very thing in queſtion, to wit, if a Council whether the Pope be there or not, is above the Pope: How will he make out his proof?

Beſides, it was not concluded in that Aſſembly of the Nations, that no Decrees concerning Reformation could be made before the Election of a Pope, but only that before that time, they ſhould not all be made, and eſpecially ſuch as moderated the Power of the

Pope, and confined it to juſt limits, it being very reaſonable that he ſhould be preſent at thoſe deliberations wherein he was ſo much concerned. The truth is, not to ſpeak of the other Decrees of Reformation that were already made in the Council, there was a very conſiderable one made relating to the Pope in the nine and thirtieth Seſſion, before the Election of *Martin* V. who was not choſen till after the one and fourtieth.

It is appointed by that Decree that the Popes being ſo much the more obliged to make the light of their Faith conſpicuous, by how much they are raiſed in Dignity above all others, ſhall for the future make in preſence of thoſe who have elected them, and before their Election be Publiſhed, their Confeſſion of Faith according to the Form preſcribed to them by the Council in the ſame Seſſion. That, without doubt was a pretty important Reformation, ſeeing

ſeeing thereby was revived what heretofore had been practiſed, and what King *Childebert* demanded of Pope *Pelagius* I. to inform himſelf of his belief, becauſe it was thought that that Pope had too much favoured the *Eutichyans*, who had ſurpriſed him by their Artifices.

The Council then might have made the other Decrees of Reformation before the Election of the Pope: but they were willing they ſhould not be made till after that the Pope was elected; and the manner how they appoint that Reformation to be made, is ſo far from favouring *M. Schelſtrate*, that it infers a concluſion quite contrary to what he pretends, and manifeſtly proves that the Pope, even when not queſtioned, is inferiour to a Council.

And indeed the Council wills and ordains in the fourtieth Seſſion, that the Pope, either with the Council, or with the Deputies of the Nations, do reform the Church *Statuit & decernit.*

in the Head and Members, as to the Points that were to be given him, and that he make that Reformation before the diſſolution of the Council. Was there ever a more authentick act of ſupreme Authority than this? When there was no more Schiſm, after the union of the three *obediences*, as *M. Schelſtrate* owns. The Council ordains, that an undoubted Pope, ſuch as certainly he that was to be elected muſt be, do reform the Church in the Head and Members; but it will have it to be done with conſent of the Council. Any Biſhop may do as much: the difference is, that he ſhall not be Preſident of the Aſſembly, where he ſhall give his Vote as all the reſt do. Now if the Council will not in Body ſet about that work, it refers it to the care of the Pope in conjunction with the Deputies of the Nations. He doth not act then in that Reformation but by the authority of the Council that deputes him; and all the advantage

tage that he is to have over the reſt, is that he ſhall be the firſt Deputy at the Head of all the others.

In fine, they preſcribe to him both the Articles upon which they would have the Decrees of Reformation made, and the time wherein they ſhould be expeded. If that be not to ordain, preſcribe, command, and conſequently if theſe be not evident marks, and Authentick acts of Authority and Superiority; I know none in the World. What will *M. Schelſtrate* then ſay now with his long diſcourſe about the five Nations agreeing that the Reformation ſhould not be made 'till after the Election of a Pope?

But once more: What does he mean with the great myſtery he makes of this, that after much debate in the Aſſembly of theſe Nations, concerning the manner how the Decree ſhould be made, whether by obliging the Pope with theſe Deputies to make the Reformation

Postea fuerunt factæ diversæ formæ decreti ad hoc: Tandem dictum fuit, quod Papa electus ligari non poterat.

formation before his Coronation, or after, it was at length, said *Papa electus ligari non poterat*, that *when a Pope is chosen he cannot be bound?* Does he by that then pretend, that we are obliged to believe, that a Pope lawfully elected, as St. *Silvester* was, is not obliged to subscribe to the Decrees of an Ecumenical Council, as that of *Nice* was: And that when such a Council hath decided the consubstantiality of the word, and forbidden Priests to marry, the Pope is not bound by these Decrees as well as the rest of Christians are, and that he is still at liberty to believe of the one what he thinks fit, and to act in regard of the other as he pleases?

Aut Coronationem Papæ, & Administrationem aliquam.

But does he not see, that to have the true meaning of those words they are to be applied to the Subject in question: to wit, whether it should be put into the Decree that the Pope who was to be chosen, should be obliged to make the Reformation before his Coronation,

nation, nay and before he could have any part in the Government of the Church, and to give good ſecurity for it, as the *German* Nation demanded? Whereupon they had reaſon to ſay that a Pope could not be obliged to a thing ſo unbeſeeming the Pontifical Majeſty, nor ſo tied up as to deprive him of the Power he hath, by Divine Right, to Govern the Church, by virtue of his Primacy, from the very inſtant that he is Canonically elected Succeſſor of St. *Peter*.

Thus ought theſe words to be underſtood in relation to what goes before, and not that the Pope is not obliged to any thing. The truth is, in the Decree that was made after that *Conciliariter*, in the fourtieth Seſſion, The Pope was not obliged in that manner, as the *Germans* had propoſed; nevertheleſs he was bound in another moſt reaſonable manner, if I may ſay ſo, that is to ſay, he was obliged to reform the Church in the Head and Members, with conſent

of

of the Council, or with the Deputies of the Nations, before the end of the Council. But if *M. Schelſtrate* will ſtill be opinionative and pretend that the Nations underſtood ſomething elſe by theſe words, *Quod Papa electus ligari non poterat*; there need no other anſwer to be made unto him, but that we muſt not ſtick to what hath been ſaid in the Aſſembly of the Nations, as he doth, but to what hath been defined *Conciliariter*, in the Seſſion, as we have juſt now mentioned.

I am apt to believe now that *M. Schelſtrate* will be fully ſatisfied with me, ſeeing I have exactly anſwered Point for Point all that he hath ſaid upon his Manuſcripts unknown to the whole World for near three hundred years, and which at preſent, he thinks fit to object to us, as moſt Authentick Pieces, in the diſſertation he hath made againſt the Declaration of the *Gallican* Church, and againſt the perpetual Edict of the King, who,

who, as Protector of the Church, and of her Canons, makes it to be obſerved in all his Territories; and in fine, againſt the Council of *Conſtance* received by all Chriſtendom, and eſpecially by *France*, which looks upon and reverences it, as its *Palladium*, the prop, ſupport and defender of its liberties.

This being ſo, there remains no more but in a few words to conclude what I have hitherto ſaid of the ſuperiority of a Council over the Pope. I made it out in the beginning that all Antiquity believed it, without the leaſt diſpute as to that Subject, as there happened about the time of the Council of *Piſa*. Then I clearly ſhew'd what that Council, and the two following of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* even approved by the Popes *Alexander* V. *Martin* V. and *Eugenius* IV. determined on that Subject in favours of Councils. As to the times that have ſucceeded theſe three Councils, it is certain that all

all those great Men, those Bishops, Cardinals, Popes, those Universities and Learned Doctors of all Nations, who, as I have said, have taught that Popes are not Infallible, have by consequent maintained that an Ecumenical Council, which cannot be doubted but to be Infallible, is above the Pope. But in a particular manner it is a Doctrin which the more renowned Doctors of *Paris* have always taught; I say, of that learned University the ancientest and most famous of all others; of whom if I should make a List, with the quotations of their Opinions, it would easily fill up a whole Book.

It is enough for me to mention here what the great Cardinal of *Lorraine*, fearing that some term might be slipt in the Council of *Trent* that might be interpreted against that Doctrine of all *France*, caused his Secretary to represent to Pope *Pius* IV. in the year 1563. These are the proper terms that he put into his instructions concerning that

that Point. *I cannot deny but that I am a* French *Man, and have been bred in the Univerſity of* Paris, *where it is held that the Pope is ſubject to a Council; and they who teach the contrary there, are looked upon and noted as Hereticks* —— *The* French *will ſooner loſe their lives, than renounce that Doctrin* — *It would be folly to think that there is one Biſhop in* France, *that ever would conſent to the opinion contrary to that truth.* *Edit. Card. Boron. 9. Jan. 1563. Pallavicin. Hiſt. conc. Trid. l. 19. c. 12. n. 10. & c. 13. n. 1.*

The truth is, The Legates of the Council being inſtructed from *Rome*, that they ſhould endeavour ſo to bring it about, that in the Canon concerning the Pope the terms of the Council of *Florence* ſhould be uſed, by putting into it that the Pope hath received the Power of Governing the Univerſal Church, *ineſſe ſummo Pontifici poteſtatem regendi Eccleſiam univerſalem*, the Biſhops of *France* oppoſed it, and were followed by moſt of the Fathers of the Council. Not that theſe words, *regendi Eccleſiam univerſalem*, *Ibid. n. 7.*

verſalem, ſignifie any thing elſe but that general Juriſdiction of the Pope, which reaches all the parts of the Church, in what concerns the Publick good of all Chriſtendom, that he may ſee to it, according to the Canons, as the Council of *Florence* expreſſes it, ſo as we have made it appear. But they would not have theſe words *Eccleſiam univerſalem*, ſo much as abuſed, to inſinuate thereby that the Pope is above the Church univerſal, taken altogether aſſembled and repreſented by an Ecumenical Council.

And therefore, to remove all ambiguity, and to prevent the wreſting of theſe words to a ſenſe contrary to the Superiority of a Council, they ſaid, that inſtead of *Regendi Eccleſiam univerſalem*, it ought to be put into the Canon, *Poteſtatem regendi omnes fideles, & omnes Eccleſias*; that *the Pope hath the Power of Governing all Believers and all Churches*: which is to be underſtood of all, not Aſſembled

bled in Council, but taken ſeverally and in particular, none of them being exempted from the Juriſdiction of the Pope in what relates to the publick good, the general Government, and the caſes limited by the Canons. So careful even to a ſcrupule, have our Anceſtors been, to ſtand upon their guard on that ſide; that no attack in the leaſt might be made againſt the ancient Doctrin always inviolably obſerved in this Kingdom. And it is moſt remarkable, that at that time when the Doctors of *Paris* moſt ſtrenuouſly maintained that Doctrin, after the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, againſt thoſe that ſtrove to invalidate their Decrees, *Innocent* VIII. ſent them a Brief, wherein he makes their *Elogy*, and amongſt other things magnifies the greatneſs of their zeal which they expreſſed for maintaining the honour and rights of the Holy *Roman* Church, and for defending the Catholick faith againſt the Hereſies, which they inceſſantly confuted.

Innoc. VIII. *Litter. ad Theol. Pariſ.* 7. *id. Sept. Ann.* 1486.

After all, that I may end where I began to handle this queſtion, I ſhall conclude with the teſtimony of another Pope, whom the Authors who will have it, as *M. Schelſtrate* will, that Popes are above Councils, can never reject. And that is *Pius* II. who when he was no more but *Æneas Sylvius Picolomini*, Clerk to the Council of *Baſil*, whereof he hath given us the Hiſtory, maintained with all his might, as well as the Doctors of *Paris*, that the Authority of a General Council is Superior to that of a Pope. But when he himſelf was promoted to be Pope, he thought, for a reaſon that may eaſily be gueſſed at, that he ought to make known to the World, that he had changed his Opinion, and that then he thought the quite contrary of what before he had maintained with all the heat that a Man ought to have who is well perſuaded of the Juſtice of the Cauſe whereof he undertakes the defence.

And that he ſolemnly did by a Bull, wherein he retracts; and in that Recantation, that he might declare that he followed another Opinion, he would not ſtiffle the manifeſt truth, concerning the nature of the Opinion which he forſook, and of the other that he embraced. For in this manner he ſpeaks in his Bull, hinting at the Conferences and Diſputes that were had with *Juliano Ceſarini Cardinal of* St. *Angelo*, who ſtood up for the intereſt of the Pope as much as he could, and yet for all that agreed in Judgment with the Council wherein he preſided. *He defended*, ſays that Pope, *the Ancient Doctrin, and he took the part of the new. We extolled the Authority of the Univerſal Council, and he magnified extreamly the Power of the Apoſtolick See.*

Tuebamur antiquam ſententiam, ille novam defendebat: Extollebamus generalis concilii autoritatem, ille Apoſtolicæ ſedis poteſtatem magnopere commendabat.

This now is plain dealing. That Pope, who was willing to change his Opinion with his condition, which after him *Adrian* VI. did not, declares fairly and honeſtly

Pius II. in Bull. retract.

in his Bull, that the Doctrin whereof he had formerly undertaken the Defence, concerning the Superiority of a Council, is the Doctrin of Antiquity, and that the other is new. And that is all I would be at, I need no more to gain my cauſe: For all that I have pretended to in this Treatiſe, is to ſhew what Antiquity hath believed concerning the Points in hand. So that after ſo authentick a Declaration of Pope *Pius* II. I have ground to ſay, as to this Article, what I have already oftener than once ſaid in relation of the others, with Pope *Celeſtin* I. writing to the Biſhops of the *Gallican Church*, *Deſinat inceſſere novitas vetuſtatem.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVI.

The ſtate of the queſtion, touching the Power that ſome Doctors have attributed to Popes over the Temporal.

I Have, if I miſtake not, made it clearly appear in all the preceding Chapters of this Treatiſe, how far the Ancient Church hath believed that the Power over Spirituals which Jeſus Chriſt gave to St. *Peter* and his Succeſſors, as Heads of the Univerſal Church extended. I am now to ſhew, whether, according to the Judgment of venerable Antiquity, they have alſo any Power over the Temporal of any perſon whatſoever, and eſpecially of Kings and other Sovereigns, by virtue of the primacy that by Divine right belongs to them.

Heretofore there have been ſome ſo paſſionately concerned for the Grandieur of the Apoſtolical See, or rather ſo blindly devoted to the Court of *Rome*, that differs much from the Holy See, that they have dared to publiſh that the Pope repreſenting the perſon of *Jeſus Chriſt*, who is King of Kings, Lord of Lords, and Univerſal Monarch, who hath an abſolute Power over all Kingdoms, from which he may even depoſe Kings, if they fail in their duty, as theſe Kings may turn off their Officers who behave not themſelves as they ſhould. And this is called the direct Power which *Boniface* VIII. thought fit to take to himſelf in his *Tuæ unam Sanctam*, that his Succeſſor *Clement* V. was obliged to recal.

That is not the queſtion here: For I cannot think that now a days there is any Man who hath the boldneſs to maintain ſo palpable and odious a falſhood. But there are a great many beyond the *Alps*, who

who by the Philoſophical diſtinction of an indirect Power which they have invented, teach that the Pope may diſpoſe of Temporals, depoſe Kings, abſolve Subjects from their Oath of Allegiance that they have taken to them and tranſfer their Dominions to others, when he judges it to be neceſſary for the good of Religion, becauſe, ſay they, ſince he hath the inſpection over every thing that concerns it, ſo hath he Power to remove, deſtroy, and exterminate every thing that may annoy the ſame; and by that clinch they cunningly enough come home to their Point though they would ſeem to forſake it. For a Pope will always take the pretext of the welfair of Religion, when he has a mind to undo a Prince, as all theſe Popes have done who after *Gregory* VII. depoſed Emperors, and ſince them *Julius* II. who transferred the Kingdom of *John* King of *Navarre* to *Ferdinand* King of *Arragon*, becauſe that King

would not declare againſt *Lewis* XII. whom this Pope perſecuted.

Now ſeeing that Opinion which the *Gallican* Church, and all our Doctors have always reckoned very dangerous and inconſiſtent with publick tranquillity, hath ſtill vouchers amongſt ſome Modern Doctors, eſpecially beyond the *Alps*: I muſt now make it appear, according to the method which I have followed in this Treatiſe, what the Doctrin of Antiquity is, as to that, and that the Ancients have always believed, that neither the Pope, nay nor the Church, have received any Power from *Jeſus Chriſt*, but only over things meerly Spiritual, and wholly diſtinct from Temporals; that therefore Kings and Sovereign Princes, according to the appointment of God, are not Subject, as to Temporals, either directly or indirectly to any Eccleſiaſtical Power, as depending upon God alone who hath eſtabliſhed them: And that they

cannot

cannot be Deposed, upon any Pretext whatsoever, by the Authority of the Church, nor their Subjects absolved from the Oath of Allegiance and Obedience that they owe them. This I shall briefly and solidly prove by matters of fact which cannot be denied.

CHAP. XXVII.

What Jesus Christ and his Apostles have Taught us as to that.

THERE is nothing in the Church of God more Ancient than *Jesus Christ* and his Apostles. Now they are the first that have Taught us that the Church and the Popes have nothing at all to do with Temporal affairs. I shall make no long Discourses here for proving of that truth, which is so conspicuous at first glance, that we need no more but

Eyes to read the words that expreſs it, without any neceſſity of a Commentary to explain them.

John 17. Don't we read in the Goſpel that the Kingdom of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and by conſequent of his Church, and his Vicar upon Earth is not of this World? That we muſt render to *Ceſar* the things that are *Ceſars*, and to God the things that are Gods? That afterward Jeſus Chriſt ſubmits himſelf, and his Vicar alſo to the Emperor, by commanding St. *Peter* to pay the Tribute that was due to him for them both? That he takes not the Crown from *Herod*, who did what he could to rob him of life, which hath given occaſion to the Church in one of her Hymns to ſay. *Non eripit Mortalia quia Regna dat Cœleſtia*; *He deprives not Kings of their Temporal Kingdoms, ſince he came into the World to give us the Kingdom of Heaven?* Is it not clear that he fled into the Deſart; when they talked of making him a King? Who would not ſo much as judg of

Matth. 22.

Matth. 17.

John 6.

Luke 12.

a

a difference betwixt two Brothers concerning their Succeſſion? And that he poſitively told his Apoſtles oftner than once, that he would by no means have them like the Kings of the *Gentiles* who bear rule over their Subjects, and far leſs have any Dominion or Juriſdicton over Kings?

Matth. 20. *Mark* 10. *Luke* 22.

May not we ſee in the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles an expreſs command given to all ſorts of Men without exception, *Every Soul*, to be Subject to Sovereign Powers? That the Powers that are are ordained of God? That whoſoever reſiſts them, reſiſts the Ordinance of God, and draweth upon himſelf Eternal damnation? That all without exception muſt be ſubject to their King, for ſo is the will of God; and that we muſt needs be ſubject not only for Wrath but for Conſcience ſake?

Rom. 13. 1 *Pet.* 2. 1 *Pet.* 2. *Rom.* 13.

This ſhews the falſity of the diſtinction of *Buchanan* and of his impious followers, who to anſwer thoſe that objected to them the expreſs

Buch. l. De Jure Regni apud Scotos.

expreſs command of God made to us in Scripture of obeying our Princes, whoever they be, and the example of Primitive Chriſtians, who, according to the Law of God, were always Loyal to the Emperors, tho Pagans, Perſecutors and Enemies of their Religion, have had the boldneſs to ſay that that was only fit in the firſt Plantation of the Church, when Chriſtians were too weak to take up Arms againſt Princes, and to ſhake off their yoke. They are to know that it was for fear of offending God, and of bringing upon themſelves Eternal damnation that they were Subject and Loyal to the Emperors, and not for fear of their wrath and of the puniſhments which with ſo much courage they ſlighted, when it was put to them to go to Martyrdom, or to deny the Faith.

Buchanan ought at leaſt to have read the fourſcore and ſeventh Chapter of the Apology of *Tertullian*, that he might have learnt this

this truth from that great Man, that it was only to obey the command of *Jeſus Chriſt* and of his Apoſtles, that the Chriſtians of his time were Loyal to their Princes, and not at all becauſe of their weakneſs, and inability of acting, and of riſing in Arms againſt them, to deliver themſelves from their cruel and tyrannical Government. *If we would*, ſaies he, *revolt by openly declaring our ſelves your Enemies, could we want Forces and a great number of good Troops, we who fill your Towns, your Iſles, your Forts, your Camps, your Armies, in a word, all, but your Temples? And though we were not equal in number, yet what is it we might not undertake, and with what courage and zeal could not we fight you, we who ſuffer our ſelves to be inhumanly put to death with ſo much Joy, if we had not learnt in the School of* Chriſt, *that we had better ſuffer our ſelves to be Maſſacred, than to kill Men in Rebellion, and in waging War againſt our Princes who perſecute us?* It was

Si hoſtes terreros, non tantum vindicta occultos, agere vellemus: deeſſet nobis vis numerorum & copiarum? —— veſtra omnia implevimus, urbes, inſulas, caſtella, caſtra ipſa &c. ſola vobis relinquimus Templa—— cui Bello non idonei, non prompti fuiſſemus, etiam impares copiis, qui tam libenter trucidamur; ſi non apud iſtam diſciplinam magis occidi liceret quam occidere?

was not then *propter iram*, but *propter conſcientiam*, to ſatisfie their Conſcience, and obey the Law of God, that theſe Primitive Chriſtians inviolably kept their Allegiance which they owed to their Emperors, though they were infidels and wicked.

This is it which we have plainly declared to us in the Goſpel, and in the Epiſtles of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*. Whereupon the true Divines, who in their Diſcourſes are not conducted by the bare light of Human Philoſophy, which many times degenerates into Sophiſtry, but by the Principles of Scripture, that cannot deceive, have in all times made this truly Theological Argument, to which no Philoſophical ſubtlety can be objected.

It is moſt evident by theſe clear and expreſs paſſages of Scripture, that Kings are ordained of God, and that the Allegiance and Obedience that Subjects owe to them, is of Divine Right.

Now

Now neither Popes nor the Church can deſtroy and overthrow what God hath fixed, nor diſpence with that which is of Divine Right, as manifeſtly appears in what concerns the eſſential parts of the Sacraments, as for inſtance, of Marriage, of which it is ſaid, *Quod Deus conjunxit, homo non ſeparet.*

Therefore neither Popes nor Councils can ever depoſe Kings, nor acquit their Subjects from their Oath of Allegiance.

And this is the more convincing, that the contrary opinion has not ſo much as the leaſt appearance of any rational ground in Scripture. For of all the paſſages that are cited for maintaining it, there is not ſo much as one that is interpreted by the Church in Councils, nor by any of the Holy Fathers, in that moſt erroneous ſenſe that they put upon them. Wherein theſe Modern Authors who in that manner do interpret them, act directly contrary to the Decree of

of the Council of *Trent*, fourth Seſſion, and againſt the Confeſſion of Faith enjoyned by *Pius* IV. which will have Scripture never to be interpreted but according to the ſenſe that Holy Church gives it, and according to the common Interpretation of the Fathers. Theſe new Doctors in that moſt dangerouſly follow the conduct of Hereticks, who for maintaining their Errors, interpret as they pleaſe, and not as the Church pleaſes, the Scriptures, that they may wreſt them to their ſenſe. This appears manifeſtly in thoſe two paſſages, upon which *Bellarmin*, *Suarez*, and after them *Becanus* and all the others, who, as theſe, have copied or abridged them, chiefly ground their opinion.

Bellar. l. 5. de Rom. Pont. c. 7. Suarez. l. 3. de Prim. Sum. Pont. c. 3. l. 6. de form. Jur. fidel. c. 4. Becan. Anglico contr. c. 3. qu. 3.

John, Laſt.

The firſt paſſage is that where Jeſus Chriſt ſaies to St. *Peter*, *Feed my Sheep*, *Feed my Lambs*. Is there ſo much as one of the Holy Fathers, who hath underſtood theſe words of the Power which St. *Peter* hath received over the Tempo-

Temporal of Princes? There is none of them who hath not expounded them as they ought to be, of the Spiritual Paſture which Popes are bound to give to Believers, by Doctrin, Example and good Government, and never one of theſe Doctors and Maſters in the Church ever let it enter into his Head to wreſt them to a Temporal meaning, as theſe new Divines have done. And more, moſt part of theſe Holy Fathers having ſaid, what is moſt true, that *Jeſus Chriſt* applies theſe words in the perſon of St. *Peter* to the whole Church in general, and to all its Paſtors in particular, if the new ſenſe that theſe new Doctors give to them were to be followed, it muſt be ſaid, that all *Biſhops* and all *Curates* had right to diſpoſe of the Temporals of thoſe who by their bad Doctrin, or ſcandalous deportment do injury to the Spiritual good of their Churches. And as to that compariſon which they make betwixt the Shepherd in reſpect of the Wolf, which

Ambroſ. l. *de dig. Statu.* c. 2. *Chryſ. hom.* 79. *in Matth.* c. 24. *Auguſt. de Agon. Chriſtian.* c. 30. *Tractat.* 47. *in Joan. in Pſ.* 108. *& alii.*

he may diſpatch *omni modo quo poteſt*; and the Paſtor of the Church in regard of a Prince who may have fallen into Hereſie; it is not only a baſe Sophiſm contrary to the rules of right Logick, but alſo impious and deteſtable, which leads Men in a full career to Parricide, and for which the Books that contain it have been juſtly condemned to the fire.

The ſecond paſſage is taken out of St. *Matthew*, Chapter ſixteenth, where the Son of God ſaies to St. *Peter*, *That whatever he ſhall bind upon Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven, and whatever he ſhall looſe upon Earth ſhall be looſed in Heaven.* Whence theſe new *Rabbies* conclude that the Succeſſors of St. *Peter* have Power to diſſolve the obligation that binds Subjects to their Prince, by the Oath they have made to him, and by the tie of Allegiance which binds them in fidelity to him. Is it not ſtrange that Catholicks ſhould take this liberty of wreſting the ſenſe of Scripture

Scripture to what they list, without any respect to the common interpretation of the Fathers, to which the Council of *Trent* obliges them? For of all the Holy Fathers who have expounded that passage, there is not so much as one to be found who hath so understood it: all of them have interpreted it of the Power that that Apostle received of loosing and absolving Penitents from their sins. Nor do the Popes themselves expound it otherways, as it may be seen in the Epistle of Pope *Paul* I. to the *French* Lords, and in that of *Adrian* I. to *Charlemagne*.

Paul. 1 *Ep.* 10. *ad procem. Fran. Adri. Ep.* 1. *ad Carol. Magn.*

To absolve Men from their sins, is it to absolve them from their Allegiance? And that *whatever*, which signifies only any sort of sin and censure, and some obligations that are not of Divine Right; can that Power, I say, be extended to the Temporal, and to the duty that Subjects owe to Kings? To persuade us of the contrary, we need only read the words that go

before theſe. *I ſhall give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, ſaies *Jeſus Chriſt*, and not, *of the Kingdoms of the Earth*, for depoſing of Kings. And thoſe that follow comprehend the uſe of the Power of the Keys that he giveth him, for opening the Kingdom of Heaven, by forgiving Men their ſins, or for ſhutting it, by not abſolving them, as he in another place expreſſes himſelf, ſpeaking to all the Apoſtles after his Reſurrection.

John 20.

But that we may not ſwerve from the words in queſtion, we need no more but read the Eighteenth Chapter of the ſame Goſpel of St. *Matthew*. There it is to be ſeen that *Jeſus Chriſt* repeats them to all his Diſciples, and gives them the whole Power that they import, by ſaying to them: *Verily I ſay unto you, that whatever ye ſhall bind upon Earth ſhall be bound in Heaven, and whatever ye ſhall looſe upon Earth ſhall be looſed in Heaven.* If theſe words comprehend the ſenſe that the

the new Authors give them, and that their meaning is alſo of the Temporal, it muſt needs be ſaid that all the Biſhops who are the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, nay and all Prieſts who have the Power of binding and looſing, may depoſe Kings, and diſpence their Subjects from the Oath of Allegiance, which is the higheſt extravagance. Or elſe, let theſe Gentlemen tell us by what Authority of the Church or Holy Fathers they find that when they were ſaid to St. *Peter*, they have a different meaning from that which they ought to have when they were ſpoken to St. *Peter* and to all the Apoſtles.

Now that is a thing they'll never be able to find out. And this is ſo true, that the Church of *Rome* her ſelf, ſticking to the ſenſe wherein all the Holy Fathers have expounded theſe words which Jeſus Chriſt ſaid to St. *Peter*, will not underſtand them but of the Power which he hath given him of bind-

Miſſ. Rom. An. 1520. *Pariſ. apud Francif. Renaud. Miſſ. Rom. à Paulo* III. *refar. Ann.* 1543. *Diurn. Monaſt. Congreg. Caſſin. à Greg.* XIII. *confir. Venet. ap. Juriſ.*

ing and looſing Souls. For in all the ancient Miſſals, Breviaries, and Diurnals, in this manner was read that Prayer, which is ſaid in the Feaſtival of St. *Peter's* Chair at *Antioch*: *Deus, qui Beato* Petro *Apoſtolo tuo, collatis clavibus animas ligandi atq; ſolvendi Pontificium tradidiſti.* This perfectly well expreſſes the nature of that Power of binding and looſing, which reaches not beyond Mens Souls and the Spiritual. But in the review that was made of the Divine Offices at *Rome* under *Clement* VIII. about the end of the laſt Age, and the beginning of this, they who took the pains of reviſing and correcting them, thought convenient to expunge that ſo eſſential a word *Animas*. Wherefore? Nay it is no hard matter to gueſs at the cauſe of it: For it was under that Pontificate that the moſt famous new Doctors wrote with greateſt earneſtneſs and zeal for the new Opinion, which gives to Popes, at leaſt the indirect

direct Power over the Temporal of Kings.

CHAP. XXVIII.

What hath been the Judgment of the Ancient Fathers of the Church as to that Point.

THAT abſolute independence of Kings as to Temporals, is Juſtified by the conſtant Tradition of the Church ſince *Jeſus Chriſt*, the Apoſtles and their Diſciples, and in all the Holy Fathers, who with common conſent teach us, that all Chriſtians, without exception, whether he be Apoſtle or Prophet, as St. *Chryſoſtome* ſpeaks, ought to be Subject to their Sovereigns, though they be Pagans and Hereticks, as it is evident they themſelves were. As to that Point, let us conſult *Juſtin*, *Athenagoras*, St. *Ireneus*, St. *Baſil*, St. *Gregory*

In E. ad Rom. c. 13.

De conſt. Mon. c. 21. or. 17.

In cap. 13. Rom. c. 25.

Nazianzen, St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Jerome*, and St. *Chryſoſtome*, St. *Auſtin* in his fifth Book of the City of God, and above all *Tertullian* in his Apology, where he ſaies that Kings are under the Power of God alone; *In cujus ſolius poteſtate ſunt, à quo ſunt ſecundi, poſt quem primi;* And that they hold the ſecond place, being the next after God. Is not that plainly enough ſaid, that betwixt God and Kings, it is not lawful to put the Popes as to the Temporal? And thereupon it is, that *Caſſiodorus*, and after him *Venerable Bede* have ſaid, that none but Kings can ſay to God, as *David* did, *Tibi ſoli peccavi*, becauſe they have no other Maſter nor Superior but God alone, who hath right to Judge and puniſh them. This they learnt from St. *Jerome*, who interpreting the ſame verſe of *David* hath theſe excellent words: *He ſpeaks in that manner becauſe he was King; he ſtood in awe of none but God alone, and had no other Superior but him.*

In Pſ. 50.

Rex enim erat, alium non timebat, alium non habebat ſupra ſe. Hyer. in Pſ. 51.

Hence

Hence it is that St. *Chryſoſtome* ſpeaking of King *Ozias* who was ſeverely rebuked by the High Prieſt, openly declares that the Power of Prieſthood is confined to the ſole Right that God hath given to Popes to admoniſh, reprove, exhort, and to make uſe of their Spiritual Arms when it is neceſſary, the care of Souls being joyned to their miniſtery, but not at all that of the Body, that is of the Temporal which God hath reſerved for Kings. That is the diſtinction which God hath made betwixt the two Powers, the one wholly Spiritual, and the other Temporal, both which ought to keep within the bounds that the Maſter of both hath ſet to either of them. And this the great *Oſius* of *Corduba* ſo vigorouſly repreſented to *Conſtantius* the *Arian* Emperor, when he wrote to him that as the Church hath no Power over the Emperor, and that he who attempts any thing upon his Empire tranſgreſſes the commands of God,

Regi corpora commiſſa ſunt ſacerdoti animæ: ille regit, hic exhortatur; ille habet arma ſenſibilia, hic Spiritualia. Chryſ. hom. 4. de verb. Iſa.

Apud Athan. Ep. ad ſolitar.

God, ſo alſo doth the Emperor, if he take to himſelf what only belongs to the Church. *It is written*, adds he, *Give unto Ceſar the things that are Ceſars, and unto God the things that are Gods.*

I know that the Modern Authors, having none of the Ancient Fathers of the Church for them, have thought at leaſt that they may make uſe of the teſtimony of a great Saint, who tho he be not of the number of thoſe who flouriſhed in the Ancient Church, and therefore are the true evidences of her belief, has nevertheleſs in a manner as great Authority, as is needful to make his Judgment paſs for a truth well confirmed. This Father is St. *Bernard*, who, upon theſe words of the Apoſtles to *Jeſus Chriſt*; *Here are two Swords*, and upon the anſwer that he made to them, *it is enough*, ſaies, that theſe two Swords ſignifie the two Powers, the Spiritual and the Temporal: that the material Sword ought to be employed for the Church, and

Bernard. l. 4. de conſider. c. 3.

Sed is quidem pro Eccleſiâ, ille ab Eccleſiâ exercendus eſt, ille Sacerdotis, iſte militis manu.

and the Spiritual by the Church; this by the Hand of the Pope, and that by the Hand of the Soldier. Hitherto there is nothing at all that favours their Opinion. But what they found upon, are the following words, *ſed ſane ad nutum ſacerdotis & juſſum imperatoris*, that is to ſay, as they interpret it, *according to the will of the Prieſt, and by the command of the Emperor.*

But it is an eaſie matter to anſwer them, firſt that that is a witty thought and an Alegory of St. *Bernards* invention. For of all the Holy Fathers who have interpreted the Goſpel unto us, there is not ſo much as one, that hath given to theſe words, *Here are two Swords*, that ſenſe, which is not at all literal, which we are not obliged to follow, nay and according to the Decree of the Council of *Trent*, which we ought not to follow for fixing a Doctrin that we ought to embrace, ſeeing it is not conform to the common interpretation of the Holy Fathers.

Se-

Secondly, We'll tell them that the words of St. *Bernard* ought to be underſtood according to thoſe of *Ceſarius Ciſtercienſis* who flouriſhed in the ſame twelfth Age; and who, purſuing the ſame Allegory of St. *Bernard*, ſaith, that the two Powers, the Spiritual and Temporal, are the two Swords; that the Spiritual hath been given to the Pope, and the material to the Emperor, and that by theſe two Swords the Church is governed and defended: it is plain enough that by that the Spiritual Sword is only given to the Pope.

Unus gladius Spiritualis eſt qui Papæ collatus eſt à Domino; alter materialis, quem tenet Imperator, ſimiliter à Deo collatus: hoc duplici gladio regitur & defenſatur Eccleſia Dei.

In the third place, if they would have us ſtick preciſely to the words of St. *Bernard*, we readily grant what they would have: but at the ſame time we muſt ask them who hath told them that, *ad nutum Sacerdotis*, ſignifies *according to the abſolute will of the Pope?* We maintain that it ſignifies there, *according to the abſolute will of the Pope?* We maintain that it ſignifies there, *According to the advice and counſel of the*

Ceſar. Ciſterc. hom. 2. in dom. 2. advent.

the Pope: which is plainly to be ſeen by the oppoſition of theſe words, *ad nutum Sacerdotis & ad juſſum Imperatoris*, which ſignifie two different things, that the Soldiers take Arms by the command of the Emperor, *ad Juſſum*, and by the advice of the Pope *ad nutum*. It cannot be ſaid that that is by the command, otherwiſe St. *Bernard* would have ſaid briskly, *ad Juſſum Sacerdotis & Imperatoris*; but he makes a diſtinction, and for the one ſaies *ad Juſſum*, and for the other *ad nutum*, by the counſel and advice.

Juſt ſo as it is ſaid of the Diſciples in the Goſpel, *Annuerunt ſociis qui erunt in alia navi*; *They beckoned to their companions that were in the other Ship*: that *annuerunt*, *beckoned* does not ſignifie a command, but an advice, an exhortation. They pray them to come: So that *ad nutum* which comes from the ſame verb *annuere*, means nothing more, but the advice, counſel and exhortation of the Pope, as *Urban*

ban II. exhorted the Emperor and all Christian Princes to cross themselves, and to take Arms against the *Saracins* for rescuing the Holy Sepulchre. And as we see at present that Pope *Innocent* XI. exhorts all the Potentates of *Europe* to League against the Turk, and sends Money to the Emperor and King of *Poland* to carry on the War in *Hungary* against that common Enemy of all Christians. It will not be said for all that, that the Pope commands these Princes to employ the material Sword: all that can be said of it is, that the *Germans* and *Polanders* make good use of their Swords in *Hungary*, and beat the Turks, *ad nutum Sacerdotis, & ad Jussum Imperatoris*; by the counsel and exhortation of the Pope, and by the command of the Emperor and the King of *Poland*.

But to prove to these new Doctors that that is the true sense of St. *Bernard*, I'll only object to them the same *Saint* in the same Treatise

Treatiſe of *Conſideration* to Pope *Eugenius*, wherein doubtleſs it will not be ſaid that he hath contradicted himſelf, by overthrowing in one place what he hath built up in another. For in this manner he ſpeaks to the Pope, upon what our Saviour three or four times told his Apoſtles, that he would not have them to be like the Kings of the Gentiles, that bear Rule over their Subjects: *It is plain*, ſaith that Holy Man, *that all Dominion is forbidden to the Apoſtles. Go then boldly and uſurp the Apoſtleſhip either by domineering, or Dominion by retaining the Apoſtleſhip. From one of the two you are excluded: If you think to retain both, you ſhall loſe both.* Are theſe the words of a Man that would have Popes ſo far to domineer over Kings as to depoſe them, and tranſfer their Crown to others, ſeeing he will not ſo much as have them to have any Dominion?

Planum eſt Apoſtolis interdicitur dominatus: ergo tu, & tibi uſurpare aude, aut dominans Apoſtolatum, aut Apoſtolicus dominatum, plane ab altero prohiberis, aut ſi utrumq; ſimiliter habere voles utrumq; perdes. l. 2. de conſ. c. 6.

Not

Not that he finds fault that *Eugenius* III. as other Popes have had, ſhould enjoy Lands and Principalities, and thoſe vaſt demains which they hold of the liberality of the Kings of *France*, and which, by the favour of times they have ſince converted into Sovereign and independent States. *Grant*, adds St. *Bernard*, *that you have that Temporal Dominion by any other title: but I declare you have it not as Pope, nor by any right of Apoſtleſhip; for St.* Peter *who had no ſuch thing, could not give what he had not.* So that Popes as Popes have no other Power but what is purely Spiritual, for binding or looſing Souls, and have nothing to do with the Temporal of the meaneſt of Chriſtians, much leſs with that of Kings.

Eſſe, ut aliâ quâcunque ratione hæc tibi vindices, ſed non Apoſtolico Jure: nec enim ille (Petrus) tibi dare quod non habuit potuit.

After this, I am not of the mind that the new Doctors will be found of alledging to us the words of St. *Bernard*, nor indeed, be able to oppoſe any conſiderable Authority to that of all the Ancient

ent Fathers, ſince *Bellarmin* himſelf, in the Treatiſe that he made of the Power of the Pope as to Temporals againſt *William Barclay*, produces only for juſtifying his Opinion, the Authors of the laſt four or five hundred years. What can all theſe upſtarts do againſt the Fathers of the Ancient Church? It is enough to ſend them packing to tell them once more, what Pope *Celeſtin* I. ſaid, *Deſinat novitas inceſſere vetuſtatem.* But becauſe we ſpeak with a Pope; and that the queſtion in Hand concerns the inteteſt of all Sovereign Popes, let us now ſee what the Belief of the Ancient Popes hath been as to the ſame Point.

CHAP. XXIX.

The Judgment of Ancient Popes touching the Power over Temporals, that some Doctors of late times attribute to the Pope.

THESE of all Men are evidences of greatest Authority, and least to be rejected, seeing the question is about a Power that some would attribute to them, and which they openly declare they have not. I mean Ancient Popes, who for most part were great Saints, and who very well understanding their obligation, have always kept within the bounds of that Spiritual Power which they have received from *Jesus Christ*, for Governing his Church according to the Laws and Canons of Ecumenical Councils, so as the Council of *Florence* defined it.

The

The truth is, they were so far from attempting any thing upon the Temporal of Emperors and Kings, tho even Infidels and Heretiсks, as to deposing of them, and absolving their Subjects from their Oath of Allegiance that they had taken to them, that they have always openly protested that they were wholly submitted unto them, as most humble Subjects, and have acknowledged, as well as the great *Osius*, that distribution which God hath made of the Temporal for Soveraigns and of the Spiritual for the Church, for the Popes and Bishops. There is nothing more evident than this in Ecclesiastical History: We need only read the Epistle of Pope *Gelasius* I. to the Emperor *Anastasius*, wherein he makes that distinction of the two Powers, one Temporal, and the other wholly Spiritual, and both independent one of another: That of *Nicolas* I. to the Emperor *Michael*, wherein he distinguishes them, *Actibus propriis & dignitatibus distinctis*,

ſtinctis, by their Dignities and proper Functions, which are of two quite different kinds; and what *Gregory* II. wrote to *Leo Iſauricus*, a moſt wicked Arch-heretick and cruel Perſecuter of Catholicks, ſaying to him in one of his Letters: *In the ſame manner as the Pope has no Power of inſpecting the Palace of Emperors, nor of conferring Royal Dignities, ſo neither hath the Emperor any right to meddle with the Government of the Church.*

Quemadmodum Pontifex introſpiciendi in Palatium poteſtatem non habet, ac dignitates regales conferendi: ſic nequit Imperator in Eccleſias introſpiciendi, &c. Gregor. II. Ep. 2. ad Leon. Iſaur.

This is enough, to ſhew that Cardinal *Bellarmine* hath impertinently made uſe of the example of that Pope againſt us, becauſe according to the relation of ſome Greek Hiſtorians, though the Latins of that time take no notice of it, he by his Authority hindered the *Romans* his Subjects from paying the Tribute which they owed him. To overthrow this weak Argument there needs no more, but to conſider *Gregory* in the quality of Pope, and then in the quality of the chief Citizen of *Rome*. As Pope

Pope he wrote to that *Iconoclaſt* Emperor long and excellent Letters, wherein joyning force to affection, he admoniſhes, reproves and exhorts him, he prays him, and threatens him with the Judgments of God; and then, ſo far was he from depoſing him from his Empire, that he prevents as much as in him lay, all *Italy* from revolting againſt him, and from acknowledging another Emperor, thereby maintaining the People, who were ready to ſhake off the inſupportable yoak of ſo wicked a Prince, in their obedience.

But when he ſaw that *Leo* grew more and more obdurate in his impiety; that he had attempted two or three times to have him aſſaſſinated; and that he gathered together all the Forces of the Empire, to come and do at *Rome*, as he gave it out in all places, what he had done at *Conſtantinople*, in beating down the Holy Images, and putting all to Fire and Sword, if they renounced not the Ancient

Religion: Then, having as Pope, declared him Excommunicated, he did, as chief Citizen of *Rome*, as the reſt did, what the Law of nature allows, to wit, take the Arms out of a mad Man's Hand, and prevent the giving him money, which he would have uſed for their ruine and deſolation, and afterward he put himſelf with the other *Romans* under the protection of *Charles Martel*, for the ſafety of their Religion and Lives, though for all that, this Pope never offered to depoſe *Leo*, nor to abſolve his Subjects from their Oath of Allegiance. For he himſelf and his Succeſſors long after acknowledged the *Greek* Emperors for their Sovereigns, and it was not before the Empire of *Conſtantin* and *Irene*, that the *Romans*, and with them the Pope, as a Member of that Civil and Politick Body, and not by his Pontifical Authority, ſeeing that they could no longer be defended againſt the *Lombards* by the *Greeks*, who had aban-

abandoned them, ſubmitted to *Charlemagne*.

This is fully and clearly made out in my Hiſtory of the *Iconoclaſts*: Wherein it may be ſeen that the example of *Gregory* II. which *Bellarmin* alledges againſt us, is nothing at all to the purpoſe. As alſo more it may be ſeen there that Pope *Adrian* I. wrote to *Conſtantin Copronymus* and to *Leo* his Son, both great Hereticks, in very ſubmiſſive terms, as to his Maſters and Sovereigns; and that's a thing which the Ancient Popes never failed to do.

Let it be conſidered with what ſubmiſſion *Pelagius* I. wrote to *Childebert* King of *France*; who would have him ſend to him a Confeſſion of his Faith. He obeyed his orders, and told him that according to Holy Scripture Popes ought to be ſubject to Kings as well as other Men, *Quibus nos etiam ſubditos eſſe Sacræ Scripturæ teſtantur.*

In what manner did *Stephen* II. implore the assistance of *Pepin* against the *Lombards*? *I beg of you*, saies he, *that favour, as if I were in your presence prostrate upon the ground at your Feet.*

Peto à te tanquam præsenti aliter assistens provolutus terræ & tuis vestigiis prosternens. Steph. II. Ep. 4. ad Pip.

Can there be terms of greater humility and of a more perfect obedience, than those which the great St. *Gregory* makes use of in one of his Letters to the Emperor *Mauricius*, who enjoined him a thing to which he had great aversion, and which in his own Judgment he thought contrary to the Service of God? *What am I*, saies he, *who represent this to my Masters, but a little Dust and a Worm? For my part, who am obliged to obey, I have done what hath been commanded me: and so I have fulfilled my obligations on both sides, for on the one Hand I have executed the Emperors order, and on the other I have not failed to represent what the cause of God required.*

Ego verò hæc Domini inter loquens, quid sum nisi pulvis & vermis? —— Ego quidem Jussioni subjectus, &c. Greg. l. 2. Jud. 11. Ep. 62. ad Mauric.

And in another Letter upon occasion of his being informed that

the

the *Lombards* had put a Biſhop to death in priſon, he would have it repreſented to the Emperors, whom he calls his moſt Serene Maſters, that if he would attempt any thing againſt the lives of the *Lombards*, that Nation ſhould have no more King, Duke, nor Count: *But becauſe I fear God*, ſaies he, *I am loth to have an Hand in any Mans death.*

De quâ re unum eſt quod breviter ſuggeras ſereniſſimis Dominis noſtris, &c.

Sed quia Deum timeo, in mortem cujuſlibet hominis me miſcere formido. l. 7. Jud. 1. Ep. 1.

He therein followed the example of one of his Predeceſſors St. *Martin* I. who would never reſiſt, tho it was in his Power, the orders of the Emperor *Conſtans* a *Monothelite* Heretick, who cauſed him to be carried away from *Rome* to *Conſtantinople*, and from thence into baniſhment. And although thoſe who would have oppoſed that violence, called out to him, that he ſhould not yield, and that he ſhould be well backed, yet he would not liſten to them, for fear it might come to Arms and Slaughter be committed, *Judging it better*, ſaid he, *to die ten times, than*

Nulli eorum accommodavi aurem, ne ſubito ſurrexit homicidia. Melius Judicavi decies mori, quam uniuſcujuſque ſanguinem in terram fundi. Epiſt. Mart. 1. ad Theodor.

than to ſuffer the Blood of one ſingle Man to be ſhed.

Theſe holy Popes who were ſo afraid leſt the leaſt drop of humane Blood ſhould be ſpilt, were far from depoſing Kings and Emperors, and giving away their Dominions to others, under pretext of the good of Religion, as long after them ſome of their Succeſſors did; which was the cauſe of ſo many cruel Wars that with Blood and Butchery filled *Italy*, *Germany*, and *France* it ſelf during the League.

In this manner the ancient Popes kept within the bounds of their Power purely Spiritual, rendering the honour and obedience which they owed to Temporal Powers, and eſpecially to their Sovereigns, nay even to their Sovereigns who were Hereticks and Enemies of their Religion. This makes it very apparent, what learned Men have ſo clearly proved, that it is no more to be doubted of; to wit, that theſe Letters of St. *Gregory* are

are ſuppoſititious, wherein he ordains that every King, Prelate, or Judg that ſhall neglect to preſerve the Privileges which that Pope gives to the Abbey of St. *Medard* of *Soiſſons*, and to three other Monaſteries of *Autun* be deprived of his Dignity, and as a deſtroyer of the Church, ſeparated from the communion of Believers, and from the Body and Blood of *Jeſus Chriſt*; that, in fine, he be ſmitten with all the *Anathema's* which till then had been thundered againſt all Hereticks, damned like *Judas*, and with him ſent headlong into Hell, if he do not do penance, and make his peace with the Monks.

Such extravagant terms as theſe, and ſo remote from the temper and ſtile of St. *Gregory* are alone ſufficient to diſcover the groſs impoſture, and the ſuppoſition of theſe pretended Bulls, which ſome have not been aſhamed to make uſe of, for ſubjecting the Crowns of Sovereigns to the Pope. That holy Pope behaved himſelf in a far

far different manner in relation to Kings and Emperors, as may be seen in all his Epistles. And that wise conduct which his Predecessors held, continued still after him until *Gregory* VII. who, according to the observation of the learned *Otho* Bishop of *Frisinguen*, was the first Pope, that contrary to so many good Examples of his Predecessors, takes to himself the Power of deposing Kings, warranting himself, as he himself saies in his Letter to *Heriman* Bishop of *Mets*, by this, that *Jesus Christ* gave St. *Peter* the Power of binding and loosing. To which *Waltram* Bishop of *Naumbourg* made the same answer that we make at present to those who abuse that passage contrary to the interpretation of all the Fathers, that that Power was given to loose Men from their sins, and not from the Oath of Allegiance which Subjects are bound by a divine and indispensable Law to observe towards their Sovereigns.

Lego & relego Romanorum regum & Imperatorum gesta, & nusquam invenio quemquam eorum ante hunc a Romano Pontifice excommunicatum, vel Regno privatum. Otto. Frif. l. 6. c. 35.

Walr. Naumbourg. Apol. pro Henr. IV. l. 1. c. 3. & 4.

It

It was upon that so weak and ruinous a foundation, That this Pope *Gregory* undertook against the Ancient Doctrin of above a thousand years, to settle that false and pernicious Opinion which he, the first of all Popes, put into practice, by Excommunicating and Deposing the Emperor *Henry* IV. For as to what is said to the contrary of Pope *Zachary* whom *Bellarmine* pretends to have taken the Crown from *Childerick*, and given it to *Pepin*, is of no force, and must needs proceed from a great ignorance of our History. It was the *French* Lords, who, after that they had consulted the Pope, to be informed by him if they might lawfully make that Translation, did in effect do it, upon the Popes answer touching that case of Conscience, whether right or wrong is not the question in Hand. The words of Ancient Authors are expres in acquainting us, that it was no more but a consultation on the part of the *French*, that *Ann.* 752.

that they might Authoriſe their action by the advice and opinion of the Doctor and Father of Chriſtians. *Miſſi ſunt ad Zachariam Papam, ut conſulerent*, ſaith an Ancient Chronicle. *They ſent to Pope Zachary to conſult him upon the Point.* *Miſſi fuerunt ad Zachariam interrogando —— ſi bene fuiſſet an non, &c.* ſaies another Author. *They ſent to Zachary to ask the queſtion if they ſhould do well or ill in depoſing Childerick, and putting Pepin in his place.* The Popes advice was only asked, which was not approved by his Succeſſor.

Chron. ver. à Pith. Edit.

Ann. Francor. Metenſ.

For *Theophanis* a Greek Author of that time, tells us that Pope *Stephen* gave *Pepin* abſolution for the ſin which he had committed by violating the Oath of Allegiance which he had taken to *Childerick*. If that be ſo, it remains to enquire which of the two Popes was in the right: But it is not my part to examine that queſtion. It is enough at preſent that I ſay, to prove that the *French* applied

plied not themſelves to *Zachary*, as to him who had power to depoſe their King, that they did not ſo much as conſult Pope *John* XV. when they placed *Hugh Capet* on the Throne, inſtead of *Charles*, who had abandoned them to cloſe with the *Germans*.

As to what concerns *Leo* III. who is ſaid to have transferred the Empire of the Weſt to *Charlemagne*, it's a mere illuſion. I have made it clearly out in the Hiſtory of the *Iconoclaſts*, that four years before *Charlemagne* was Proclaimed *Auguſtus*, he was Maſter of *Rome*, and of *Italy* as King of *France*, and that he took not that title of Emperor, which he did not at all care for, but becauſe the *French* Lords and *Romans* that were his Subjects beſought him to do it: And it is certain that the Pope was the firſt who rendered Homage to him as to his Emperor, and that he had no other part in that Ceremony but the ſame which the Archbiſhop of *Reims* has

has in the Coronation of our Kings.

It is certain then, as *Otho* of *Friſinguen* aſſures us, that *Gregory* VII. was the firſt Pope that offered to depoſe Kings. I have made it clearly enough out in my Hiſtory of the *Fall of the Empire*, how he formed and purſued ſo terrible an enterpriſe: But I ſhould be very glad, that it might be taken from a very famous *ultramontean* Author, *Onuphrius Panvinius à Veroneſe*, of the Order of St. *Auſtins* Hermits, in the life of that Pope. In this manner he ſpeaks of it. *Gregory* VII. *is the firſt of the Popes of* Rome, *who, ſupported by the Norman Forces, truſting to the great aſſiſtance of Money, which he got from the Counteſs Mathilde a moſt powerful Princeſs in Italy, and encouraged*

Primus omnium Romanorum Pontificum Gregorius VII. *armis Normannorum fretus, opibus Comitiſſæ Mathildis mulieris per Italiam potentiſſimæ confiſus, diſcordiâ Germanorum Principum Bello civili laborantium inflammatus, præter majorum morem, contemptâ Imperatoris Authoritate & Poteſtate, cum ſummum Pontificatum obtinuiſſet, Cæſarem ipſum, à quo ſi non electus, ſaltem confirmatus fuerat, non dico excommunicare, ſed etiam Regno Imperioq; privare auſus eſt. Res ante ea ſecula inaudita. Nam de fabulis quæ de Arcadio, Anaſtaſio, & Leone Iconomacho circumferuntur, nihil moror.*

encouraged by the divisions amongst the Princes of Germany, who were engaged in a Civil War, dared, contrary to the custom of his Predecessors, slighting the Imperial Authority and Power; so soon as he was promoted to the Papacy, I shall not only say to Excommunicate, but even depose from Kingdom and Empire, the very same person, by whom, if he was not chosen, he was at least confirmed in his dignity. A thing unheard in all foregoing Ages: For I take no notice of the tales that have been spread abroad of Arcadius, Athanasius, and Leo Isauricus the Iconoclaste. Before that, (saith the same Author) *Popes were Subject to the Emperors, and durst neither judg nor resolve of any thing that concerned them.*

Thus the Ancient Popes behaved themselves, and so much they believed of their Pontifical Authority, which does not at all reach the Temporal. And to this you may add, that in the eight first Ecumenical Councils, there is nothing to be found but what speaks

Imperatoribus subtrant de iis Judicare; vel quicquam decernere non audebat Papa Romanus.

Onuphr. Pavin. in vit. Greg. VII. ex edit. Gretser. pag. 271. 272.

the compleat ſubmiſſion that is due to Emperors and Kings; but nothing that can in the leaſt encroach upon or invalidate the abſolute independence of their Temporal Power. Now if in ſome of the Councils which ſucceeded the Pontificat of *Gregory* VII. Kings have been threatned to be depoſed, and if an Emperor hath been actually depoſed, that was not done by the way of deciſion; and though a Council had made a deciſion as to that, yet it muſt only have been an unwarrantable attempt upon the Right of Princes, and could have been of no greater Force than the Bulls whereby it hath been often enough offered at to diſpoſſeſs them of their States, but which have always been condemned and rejected as abuſive. For, after all, there will be reaſon everlaſtingly to ſay, that which all Antiquity hath believed, that the Church her ſelf, infallible as ſhe is, which the Pope according to the ſame Antiquity is not, hath not

re-

received from her heavenly ſpouſe the gift of Infallibility, but as to matters purely Spiritual, and wholly abſtracted from the Temporal and the Kingdom of the World, wherein *Jeſus Chriſt*, who hath ſaid, *my Kingdom is not of this World*, would never meddle.

CHAP. XXX.

What hath always been the opinion of the Gallican *Church, and of all* France *as to that. The concluſion of this Point and of the whole Treatiſe.*

HItherto I have made appear what hath been the Judgment and Doctrin of *Jeſus Chriſt*, of his Apoſtles, the Fathers, Ancient Popes, and of the Councils, that is, of all venerable Antiquity, concerning that Power, at leaſt

indirect, which ſome would attribute to Popes. Now ſeeing the moſt Chriſtian Kingdom, above all other States of Chriſtendom, hath always ſtuck cloſe to the Ancient Doctrin of the Church, which is the ſolid foundation of their Liberties: Therefore it was that all the Biſhops of *France* repreſenting the *Gallican* Church, the faculty of Theology of the great Univerſity of *Paris*, ſo much reſpected in the World, the chief Parliament of *France*, and in imitation of it, the reſt, acting in the Name, and by the Authority of the King, as Protector of the Canons and holy Decrees, have even in this Kingdom maintained the Ancient Doctrin, and upon all occaſions condemned that pernicious novelty which is contrary to it. This I intend briefly to prove.

The *Gallican* Church, ſince the ſettlement of the moſt Chriſtian Monarchy amongſt the *Gaules*, hath always inviolably obſerved the Rights of the Royalty in her Coun-

Councils, which were ſo often called by the ſole Authority of *Clovis* and his Succeſſors, eſpecially during the firſt and ſecond race of our Kings. And when the Popes would have attempted any thing upon their Temporal, the French Biſhops have always oppoſed it with all imaginable force and vigour. Of this I ſhall give you ſome inſtances.

Lotharius, *Louis*, and *Pepin*, Sons of *Louis* the *Debonaire*; inſtigated by ſome who had a mind to make their advantage of the diſſentions that they had ſowed betwixt the Father and his Children, roſe in Arms againſt him, and found means to engage into their party Pope *Gregory* IV. who came in perſon to their Camp, to favour their pretentions. The Emperor on the other Hand, accompanied with a great part of the Biſhops of *France*, failed not to advance with a Powerful Army, in *May* the year following, as far as *Worms*, not far diſtant from the

Auct. Anonym. Vit. Ludov. Pii.

Ann. 832.

Camp of the Princes his Children.

ut si more prædecessorum suorum aderat, cur tontas necteret moras non sibi occurrendo?

Immediately he sent them some of his Bishops, who exhorted them to return to their duty, and who told the Pope in his name, that if he was come according to the custom of his Predecessors, he much wondered that he had so long delayed to come and wait upon him. But when it was discovered that instead of keeping within the bounds of a bare Mediator, for reconciling the Children to their Father, so as it was believed, he was come with a design to Excommunicate the Emperor and his Bishops, if they obeyed not his Will and the Princes for whom he thereby manifestly declared himself against the Emperor: Then these Bishops, without being startled, made it known to him plainly, that in that they would no ways obey him, and that if he was come to Excommunicate them, he should return Excommunicated him-

Nullo modo se velle voluntati ejus succumbere: sed si Excommunicaturus adveniret, Excommunicatus abiret, cum aliter se habeat antiquorum Canonum autoritas.

himſelf, ſeeing the Authority of the ancient Canons preſcribes and ordains the quite contrary to what he attempts.

The truth is that expreſſion ſeems to me a little too high: but it cannot be denied but that it makes it clearly out to us, that the Biſhops of *France* would not at all ſuffer that the Pope ſhould offer to enjoyn any thing concerning the Government of the State; and the Temporal intereſts which were the Points that occaſioned the War; and beſides that, they were very well perſuaded that Popes are Subject to the Holy Canons, and by conſequent to the Councils which have made them.

Moreover, the great claſhing that *Philip* the *Fair* had with Pope *Boniface* VIII. who openly attacked the Rights of his Crown, is very well known; and it is alſo well known what the *Gallican* Church did for maintaining them,

and the cautions they took againſt the Bull *unam Sanctam*, which raiſed the Popes, in Temporals above all Sovereigns. It is likewiſe known what deciſions ſhe gave *Louis* XII. for the preſervation of his Rights, in the difference that he had with *Julius* II. and what the Clergy of *France* Aſſembled at *Mante* during the League, declared upon occaſion of the Bull of *Gregory* XIV. againſt *Henry* IV.

Anno 1591.

To the *Eſtats Gen-ral* at *Paris*. 1614, 1615.

Now if Cardinal *Duperron* hath in his Speeches ſaid ſomething not altogether conſiſtent with the Doctrin always maintained by the Clergy of *France*, that is but the opinion of one private Doctor, who hath oftener than once changed his ſentiment, and on that occaſion tranſgreſſed the orders of the Eccleſiaſtical Chamber of the States General, in name of whom he ſpake, and who would have him only repreſent to the third Eſtate, that it did not belong to them.

them, but to the Church, to decide that Point of Doctrin concerning the Pontifical Power, as it ſeemed they had done in the firſt Article of their addreſs.

That was the ſole cauſe of the difference that was betwixt the two Chambers, as that of the Clergy informed Pope *Paul* V. in the anſwer they made to his Brief of the laſt of *January* one thouſand ſix hundred and fifteen. *We were not a little troubled,* ſay theſe Prelates, *to ſee even Catholicks tranſported with an undiſcreet zeal offer to take cogniſance of matters relating to Faith, and to decide ſuch kind of queſtions as they muſt needs firſt be inſtructed about by their Paſtors before they can meddle with them. But our grief was ſoon changed into gladneſs, when theſe Gentlemen yielding to our Admoni-*

Augebamur enim non mediocriter, cum videremus ipſos Catholicos, zelo quodam minus prudenti abreptos cognitionem earum rerum quæ ad fidem pertinent ad ſe trahere, & de quæſtionibus ejuſmodi ſtatuere velle, quas niſi paſtorum ſuorum vocibus edocti, non debeant attingere. Sed ea moleſtia è vestigio in lætitiam verſa eſt, poſtquam iidem noſtris monitis & juſtis rationibus adducti, demum agnoverunt, omnem hanc autoritatem penes Eccleſiam, eoſque ſolos eſſe quos illa fidelium gregi preeſſe voluerit. 7 Calend. Martij.

tions

tions and juſt Remonſtrances, at length acknowledged that none but the Church hath that Authority, and that none but the Paſtors have from her received the Power and Right of inſtructing and guiding the Flock. That was the thing in queſtion, and not at all the ſubſtance of the Article wherein the Clergy of *France* agreed, though they judged it not a proper buſineſs to be propoſed in the Eſtates, eſpecially at that time.

The truth is that Chamber of the Clergy was ſo far from invalidating in the leaſt the ſubſtance of the Doctrin contained in that Article, and in all times received in *France* concerning the abſolute independence of our Kings as to Temporals, that on the contrary they oftener than once proteſted, *that they acknowledged that independence, and that it ought to be held for a Maxim, That the King in Temporals can have no other Superiour*

Manifeſte de ce qui ſ'eſt paſſa aux Eſtat, Generaux entre le Clergé & le Tiers Eſtat. 1615

riour but God alone, and that the Vicar of Jeſus Chriſt hath no juriſdiction over matters purely Temporal.

Diſcours veritable de ce qui ſe paſſa aux Eſtats Generaux.

So that although the Clergy declared that it belonged only to the Church to handle and decide a Point of Doctrin and Religion, nay and that that was not an affair to be conſulted about in the Eſtates: yet they avowed that they believed in ſubſtance the ſame thing which the third Eſtate had propoſed, and which the late Prince of *Conde* a great Defender of the Catholick Faith, moſt prudently repreſented to the King in Council the fourth of *January* the ſame year, and which the Univerſity of *Paris* expreſſed in moſt ſignificant terms in their Petition preſented to the Eſtates upon the ſame occaſion, the two and twentieth of *January:* To wit, *That our Kings depend upon none but God as to Temporals, and that there is no Power upon Earth that can*

Procés verbal de ce qui s'eſt paſſé en la Chambre du Tiers Eſtat.

Avis donné au Roy en ſon Conſeil par M. le Prince ſur le Cahier du Tiers Eſtat.

Diſcours veritable de ce qui s'eſt paſſé, &c.

can depoſe them, nor diſpence with, or abſolve their Subjects from the Obedience and Allegiance that they owe to them, under any pretext whatſoever. That was their Doctrin, which they would not have to be weakned or impaired in the Remonſtrances which they had cauſed Cardinal *Du Perron* to make to the Chamber of the third Eſtate.

And certainly after ſo many proofs, one cannot doubt of the Opinion of that learned Clergy, always uniform as to that Point. I might here produce a great many very convincing Teſtimonies: but that would not be neceſſary now, after that famous declaration which the Archbiſhops and Biſhops aſſembled at *Paris* by order of the King in the year one thouſand ſix hundred and eighty two, as repreſenting the *Gallican* Church, have made of their Judgment, concerning the Eccleſiaſtical Power. This is the firſt Article of it, where-

whereby they declare, *That God hath given to St.* Peter *and his Succeſſors the Vicars of Jeſus Chriſt, and to the Church Power over Spiritual matters, which belong to Eternal Salvation, but not over Civil and Temporal, The Lord having ſaid,* My Kingdom is not of this World; and Render unto *Ceſar* the things that are *Ceſars,* and unto God the things that are Gods. *And that Apoſtolical Decree ought to remain firm and inviolable,* Let every Soul be ſubject unto the higher Powers, for there is no Power but of God: The Powers that be are ordained of God: whoſoever therefore reſiſteth the Power, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God. *That Kings and Princes then, according to the Ordinance of God, are not ſubject to any Eccleſiaſtical Power, and that they cannot be depoſed, neither directly nor indirectly, by the Power and Authority of the Keys of the Church; that their Subjects cannot be exempted from the obligation*

obligation that lies upon them to obey them, nor be absolved from the Oath of Allegiance which they have taken to them; and that that Doctrin ought inviolably to be observed as not only necessary for the publick Peace, but also useful to the Church; And as being conform to the word of God, the Tradition of the Fathers, and the examples of Saints. This now is a positive Doctrin that saith all; and all that I have written upon this Subject, hath only been to exhibit the convincing proofs of all the parts of that Article, which contains so excellent and solid a Declaration.

As to the sacred Faculty of Theology, it hath never failed on any occasion to evidence its zeal for the true Doctrin, authorising and confirming this, by its Decrees, and Censures of the contrary opinion, from time to time renewed, especially in the years 1413. 1561. 1595. 1610. 1611. 1620. 1726. And lately in the con-

condemnation of an *ultramontanean Jacobin*, by renewing the cenſure of the Book of *Santarelli*. This appears ſtill in a ſtronger and more Authentick manner, by the ſix Propoſitions that were preſented to the King in the year one thouſand ſix hundred threeſcore and three, in name of the Faculty; By my Lord *De Preſixe* Archbiſhop of *Paris*, Viſitor of the *Sorbonne*.

Non eſſe Doctrinam Facultatis, quod ſummus Pontifex aliquam in Temporalia Regis Chriſtianiſſimi autoritatem habeat, imo Facultatem ſemper obſtitiſſe etiam iis qui indirectam tantum modo illam Autoritatem eſſe voluerunt.

Take here two of them which relate to that Article.

The firſt, *That it is not the Doctrin of the Faculty, that the Pope hath any Authority over the Temporal of the moſt Chriſtian King; that on the contrary it hath always oppoſed even thoſe who would have that Authority only indirect.*

Eſſe Doctrinam Facultatem ejuſdem, quod Rex Chriſtianiſſimus, nullum omnino in temporalibus habet ſuperiorem præter Deum, eamq; eſſe ſuam antiquam Doctrinam, à quâ nunquam receſſura ſit.

The other, *That it is the Doctrin of the ſame Faculty, that the moſt Chriſtian King hath no other Superior in Temporal affairs but God alone; and that that is the ancient*

ancient Doctrin of the Faculty from which it will never ſwerve.

After all, theſe Decrees of the *Gallican* Church and of the ſacred Faculty have always been powerfully ſupported by the Edicts of the Kings, and the thundring ſentences of Parliament, againſt all ſuch as ever durſt in *France* maintain and teach that pernicious Doctrin condemned by theſe Deciſions and Cenſures, which in this Kingdom are reverenced as proceeding from God, upon whoſe word they are grounded. So that a Doctrin ſo well eſtabliſhed, and which all *France* look upon as the chief foundation of our Liberties, can never be ſhaken, much leſs overturned by Novelty, which, whatſoever effort it may make, ſhall never amongſt us prevail againſt Antiquity, to which we will always ſtick cloſe, as to the Principle and ſolid Foundation of true Tradition.

Of 2 Decemb. 1561. 4 Januar. 1594. 7 & 10 Jan. 1595. 27 May, & 26 Nov. 1610. 27 July 1614. 2 Jan. 1615. &c.

And

And therefore alſo it is that the King, as Protector of the Canons of the Councils received in *France*, and of the *Gallican* Church in particular, by his perpetual Edict regiſtred in all the Parliaments, not only prohibits all his Subjects, and all ſtrangers within his Kingdom, to teach or write any thing contrary to the Doctrin contained in the Declaration of the Clergy of *France*, but alſo commands all ſecular and regular Profeſſors to ſubmit to and teach it.

Wherein it is moſt evident that his Majeſty does no more but what many Generals of Orders do, who, for preſerving the uniformity of Doctrin in their Congregation as to Points which they look upon to be of great importance for the good and reputation of their Body, oblige their inferiours to maintain and teach certain Opinions which the whole Order hath adopted againſt others who diſpute them. Much more

ought it to be lawful for ſo great a King, ſo zealous for Religion, and for the Ancient Doctrin, upon which are founded the inviolable rights of one of the moſt Auguſt Crowns of *Chriſtendom*, and liberties of the *Gallican* Church, to oblige his Subjects, for preſervation of Uniformity of Opinion within his Kingdom, as to Points of that importance, to maintain and teach the Doctrin of the Clergy of *France*, in all things conform to that of the Ancient Church.

And ſo much I had to ſay in this Treatiſe, wherein, always following that Principle which both Catholicks and Proteſtants equally agree to, I have held a mean betwixt the two extremes that ought to be ſhunned. One is of thoſe, who, blinded by the hatred which they have conceived againſt the Church of *Rome* from which they have ſeparated, would take from the Pope the Prerogatives

which

which Antiquity hath believed were given him by *Jeſus Chriſt*, as Succeſſor of St. *Peter*. The other of thoſe, who through a zeal not according to knowledg, nay, and if I dare ſay with thoſe Cardinals of *Paul* III. through a too great compliance with Popes, attribute to them, what Antiquity inſtructing us by the Fathers, the Councils, and even by the moſt Ancient and moſt holy Popes themſelves, have believed they never have received from *Jeſus Chriſt*.

Seeing the mean is the place of Virtue and Truth: I think one cannot miſtake the way when he follows Antiquity for his guide, which placing us with it ſelf in that lovely mean, will make us condemn our Proteſtants who are in the firſt extreme, and abandon thoſe who abandon themſelves to novelty, under the conduct whereof they are fallen into the other extremity.

Now if it be ſaid to me that theſe new Authors, who have fallen into that which I call the ſecond extreme, have only done ſo out of the great zeal which they have for Religion: It will be eaſie for me to anſwer with the great Pope St. *Leo*, *That many times Men carry on their private intereſts under a ſpecious pretext of Piety, and that every one maketh Religion to be the handmaid of his luſts and deſires.* The truth is, it may very well be, that the luſtre of the Purple, wherewith at *Rome* the three Authors who have moſt highly exalted the Power of Popes, by raiſing it beyond all the bounds that Antiquity preſcribed to it, were cloathed, may have dazled the Eyes of that croud of Modern who have followed them, and who for all that, what ever they may have expected, never received a like reward.

Privatæ cauſæ pietatis aguntur obtentu, & cupiditatum quiſque ſuarum Religionem habet velut pediſſequam.
St. Leo Epiſt. 25. ad Theodoſ. Imper.

But not to Judge of the ſecret motives of their Heart, which it belongs to God alone to dive into,

I had rather Anſwer with *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, one of the moſt zealous Defenders of the true Doctrin: *Mos iſte ſemper in Eccleſiâ viguit, ut quo quiſque religioſior foret, eo promptius novellis adventionibus contrairet. It hath always been the cuſtom in the Church, that the more of Piety and Religion any one had, the more ready he was to oppoſe all new inventions in Doctrin.* *Vincent. Lrin. l. 1. Commonit. c. 3.*

And to conclude my Work with the excellent words of the ſame Author, I ſhould be glad that Men would think that in compoſing it I have had no other deſign but to diſcharge the duty of a good Catholick, by doing what he enjoyns me, when he ſays:

Chriſtianus Catholicus providebit ut Antiquitati inhæreat, quæ prorſus non poteſt ab ullâ Novitatis fraude ſeduci.

The Catholick Chriſtian will have great care to ſtick cloſe to Antiquity, which cannot be deceived by the artifice of Novelty.

FINIS.

Books Printed for, and ſold by Joſeph Hindmarſh, *at the* Black Bull *in* Cornhill, *over againſt the* Royal Exchange.

THE famous Hiſtory of *Auriſtella*, Tranſlated from the Spaniſh.

The whole Art of Converſe.

Cicero's three Books touching the Nature of the Gods, done into Engliſh.

A Breviary of the *Roman* Hiſtory written in Latin by *Eutropius*. Tranſlated into Engliſh by ſeveral young Gentlemen privately Educated in *Hatton-Garden*.

The Countermine, by Dr. *Nelſon*.

Hiſtory of Count *Zoſimus*, done into Engliſh.

Love Letters between a Noble Man and his Siſter.

The Doctors Phyſitian or Dialogues concerning Health. Tranſlated out of French.

The Prerogative of Primogeniture, by *David Tenter*, B. D.

Navigation rectified, by *Peter Blackborough*.

The Works of Mr. *John Oldham* together with his Remains.

A Diſcourſe of Monarchy, as it Relates to the Succeſſion of his Royal Highneſs *James* D. of *York*.

Seneca's Morals by way of Abſtract, by Mr. *Leſtrange*.

Beauſions or a new diſcovery of Treaſon, in an Anſwer to the Proteſtant Reconciler.

Familiar Epiſtles of Col. *Hen. Martin*.

The Rampant Alderman, a Farce.

Dame *Dobſon* or the Cunning Woman, a Comedy.

Jovial Crew or Merry Beggar, a Comedy.

Venice preſerved, a Tragedy.

Sir *Hercules Buffoon*, a Comedy.

The diſappointment, a Play.

An Eſſay upon Poetry.

Choice new Songs never before Printed by *Tho. Dirfey* Gent.

The Malecontent being the ſequel of the progreſs of Honeſty.

Vivat Rex, a Sermon Preach'd at *Briſtol* on the 9th of *Septemb.* 1683. by Mr. *Kingſton*.

The Hiſtory of the Civil Wars of *France*, Written in *Italian* by *H. C. D'Avila*, Tranſlated out of the Original. The Second Impreſſion, whereunto is added a Table.

FINIS.